business tax rates by virtue of the multiple $25,000 surtax exemptions available to these units, yet they are simultaneously benefiting from the economies inherent in large businesses. As a result, the genuine small businessman or small corporation is placed at a competitive disadvantage vis-a-vis large businesses which are operating in multiple-corporate form. A collateral effect of this tax inequity is to render the truly small enterprise a less attractive investment. The President's proposal would allow only one surtax exemption to multicorporate enterprises, and thus restore competitive balance and enhance the prospects of small businesses to attract outside capital.

4. Research and development: The administration recommends, subject to certain conditions, a current deduction for tax purposes for expenditures for machinery and equipment used directly in research and development activities. Under the general rule of the proposal, expenditures for equipment used only part time for research and development purposes, or used to any extent in the performance of a Federal contract would not qualify for immediate deductions. Nevertheless, under a special provision for small business, any expenditures for equipment used directly for research and development could be expensed in an amount up to 4 percent of $500,000 of total expenditures for research and development. For purposes of this special provision, equipment used only part time but at least 50 percent of the time for research and development would qualify, as would research and development equipment not used exclusively in the performance of a Federal contract. The current deduction for research and development expenditures for equipment used in Federal contract work should materially improve the position of the small businessman in competing for Government contracts. In the final report of the House Small Business Committee to the 87th Congress, the committee concluded that the percentage of Government contract awards for research and development going to small business was inadequate. The President's proposal should increase the capability of small firms to participate in these programs. The long-term interests and perhaps the ultimate survival of this country will depend to a considerable extent upon the effectiveness and speed with which its defense research and development program is carried out. Small business has contributed in the past to this important effort, and I believe the enactment of the President's proposal will provide incentives for future participation.

I am hopeful that your committee will give serious consideration to the effect of new tax legislation on the small businessman as you begin executive sessions on the administration's bill. The strength and health of the small business community which the President's proposals will generate should provide a strong stimulant for the entire economy. Since this result is of such vital importance to this country today, I believe that the President's proposals deserve your most serious consideration.

Sincerely yours,

TOM STEED,
Member of Congress, Chairman, Subcommittee on Taxation, Select Committee on Small Business.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 1, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Harold L. Gore, chaplain, St. Elizabeths Hospital, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Proverbs 29:23: *A man's pride shall bring him low; but honour shall uphold the humble in spirit.*

O God, our Heavenly Father, from whom we come, without whom we are nothing, and to whom we owe everything that we are and have, mercifully grant to us an awareness of Thy presence, that in the execution of the responsibilities which are ours we may not feel alone. Instill in us the sense of purpose that enables us to see our work as work for Thee, and, therefore, Thy work. In difficulties may we not be ashamed to admit our limitations and in accomplishments may we not overestimate our abilities. Help us to see ourselves not as masters but as servants, and as servants, our principal duty, that of humble obedience. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Inter-State and Foreign Commerce may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE FORGE OF DEMOCRACY—THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, "The Forge of Democracy—The House of Representatives"—is the work of Neil MacNeil. It is an aptly titled, excellent, well-written biography of this House. It was penned by a highly competent, engaging, and brilliant writer.

Neil MacNeil knows this House of Representatives—its strength and its power—its weakness and its failures—as few reporters do. When many others in his profession have concentrated on another body, he has made it his business to study and understand this body. His intimate knowledge of its inner workings, his personal acquaintance with many Members, his fine appreciation of what is accomplished here have caused him to admire and love this place.

Because he combines a friendly personality, fine intellect, and a high degree of fairness and objectivity, it is easy to understand the high regard in which he is held by those who know him on this Hill and by his associates in the great field of journalism.

"The Forge of Democracy" fills a vacuum in the vivid, fascinating story of this House. I am sure that historians and students will avidly welcome and acclaim its publication.

Richard L. Lyons, who so ably and fairly covers the activities on this side of the Capitol for the Washington Post, is another of the all-too-few reporters who know this House. Let me quote him on this book:

> Strangely almost nothing has been written on the House as an institution. Pieces of its story have been stuffed into biography and political science tracts. But aside from George B. Galloway's slender volume 2 years ago, Neil MacNeil's book is the first effort in nearly half a century to trace the growth of the House as a living institution, relate its present to its past, and put it in perspective. It is a major and valuable contribution.

Listen to Neil MacNeil as he brings his fine work to a close:

> The House of Representatives was created in the 18th century as the representative branch of the Government. The 19th century saw the President claim the same representative character. The 20th century found the once aristocratic Senate making the same claim, and even the Supreme Court has taken on a representative quality. The history of the American Republic has been the continuing success of the Nation's continuing experiment in freedom through representative government.
>
> In this historic process, the House of Representatives has played a primary and fundamental role, and by so doing, the House has helped create a nation more prosperous, more powerful, and more free than the world has ever known. The House has been, in this larger sense, the solemn assembly of which Josiah Quincy spoke a century and a half ago.
>
> It has remained what it was then, the representative of the people, the depositary of their power and the image of their wisdom.

Mr. Speaker, I noted that the distinguished Senator from Montana and majority leader of the Senate, Senator MANSFIELD, paid tribute to Neil MacNeil and his book in remarks made on the Senate floor yesterday. I am delighted and happy to join in this praise and I congratulate Time magazine's chief congressional correspondent, Neil MacNeil, for the great contribution he has made to history in his story of the House of Representatives.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that our colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] has taken this time to pay a well-deserved tribute to a great Capitol reporter, Neil MacNeil, for the fine book he has written on the House of Representatives, under the title of "The Forge of Democracy."

It has been my privilege to read this book from cover to cover.

As an historical document on the House of Representatives, it has no equal; as a report of the activities of the House which I have known during my service here, it is an unusually accurate treatise. Mr. MacNeil has been a

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

close observer of the House and an able and devoted student of its processes. I believe he has succeeded in describing the role of the House and in stating its position in the American system of government as no other person who has written in this field in recent years. His book should help give to the House the public image which it deserves.

The House of Representatives is the most important arm of the Federal Government, because it is the people's arm. It may not always have been the most spectacular or the most glamorous, but it has always been the most responsive to the people's will.

Mr. MacNeil has told this story through the lives and services of many of those immortal Americans who have preceded us here. He has brought many of our most renowned predecessors back to life and described their activities in this historic Chamber. He has told us who it was that made the House what it is.

The book will appeal particularly to Members of the House who are familiar with the proceedings of the House, who know their colleagues, who know something about the day-to-day, the week-to-week, and the year-by-year operations of this body.

This book comes as one of the few that describes the House we know. Most textbooks on Government fail to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Neil MacNeil on his fine work. I recommend it to my colleagues, to students, and to all those interested in representative government as it operates in our country.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, by the generosity of Mr. MacNeil, I have a copy of his book. I have not finished reading it, but I have read far enough to know that he has written a good account of the position, the prestige, and the standing of the House of Representatives.

As one who has served here, may I say, Mr. Speaker, almost the major part of my life; as one who certainly has spent most of his adult years here in the House of Representatives; and, as one who has elected to stay in the House of Representatives when other very attractive opportunities have been offered, I have through the years become not jealous of the position of the House of Representatives; I have become one who believes that the House of Representatives through the years has in truth and in fact been the forge of democracy.

So, I am happy on this occasion to join in commendation of Neil MacNeil who has written a very readable book, one that I hope will be read by millions of Americans who, reading it, will be better informed as to the position of the House of Representatives in this great Republic which, after all, is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma, [Mr. ALBERT], and the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. I think it fitting that these remarks should be made on today. This is May 1. This is the day that we have established in our country to counteract the Communist celebration on May 1—a celebration which we have called Law Day. All over our country today we are marking this occasion.

Mr. Speaker, one cannot talk about law, about justice, and about all of the other concepts which have made this country what it is, the greatest country in the history of mankind, without reflecting on the magnificent role played by the House of Representatives in establishing and maintaining these freedoms. We have some people in our country today as in the past who like to criticize this body, who say that we have been unable to keep up with the times, so to speak. Yet when we look at the record and realize what the House of Representatives and the other body, for that matter, have done in moving the United States ahead in the space age, the atomic age, through the magnificent developments of the 20th century, then I think we can renew our faith in popular government as represented by the House of Representatives and dismiss the critics as men of little faith.

I think this book needed writing. I think Mr. MacNeil has done an outstanding service in writing it, and I join with all of the others in extending congratulations to him. He is an outstanding writer and a fine man. He is a credit to his profession.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the leadership on both sides and the man who instigated this, our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] in praising and bringing to the attention of our colleagues this extraordinary book.

It is, I believe, the best book on the House of Representatives that has been written to date in American history. Certainly this is true in modern times. It is full of history. It is full of anecdotes. It is altogether a fascinating book. This view, which is obviously shared by many of us who have read it, is also shared by a man who knows more of the precedents and the history of the House of Representatives than any man living. I refer to the Parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler.

Mr. Speaker, Lewis Deschler is quoted as saying:

> I found "Forge of Democracy" so fascinating that I could not lay it down. A great book, it makes abundantly clear the complex inner workings of the House of Representatives and gives the House the recognition that it deserves for its endeavors and achievements.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this book to every Member of the House of Representatives and to all those in this country who are truly interested in our Government.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, for a better knowledge and greater appreciation of this body in which we serve, I urge every Member of the House of Representatives to read Neil MacNeil's superb book "Forge of Democracy." More importantly, all Americans should study it carefully in order to secure a better understanding of the interesting history and vital role the House has played in the preservation and expansion of the Nation's freedom. This book is a timely and affirmative answer to the criticisms of the legislative branch of the Government. I congratulate the author on a scholarly commentary and on his most helpful contribution to a proper evaluation of the legislative process.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in their laudation of the book, "Forge of Democracy," written by my good friend, Neil MacNeil. I thoroughly enjoyed reading this book. It is scholarly without being dull. He presents the facts in a readable manner. He gives meaning and life and color to historic events and personages, some well known and others little known. This book should be must reading for those who wish to understand the Congress, and particularly the House of Representatives. This book is of such character that it would make excellent supplemental reading for any textbook on government.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who have spent so many years in the House of Representatives and who love this House of Representatives, as so often said by the late Speaker Sam Rayburn, find in this book many, many things of tremendous interest. Neil MacNeil has made a distinct contribution in having the House better understood as the voice of the American people. My congratulations to Neil on an extraordinary, fine book.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in commending this historic book on the House of Representatives. I have had an opportunity to read this book. It is a significant book because it effectively and lucidly analyzes the historical role of the House of Representatives. It places in proper per-

spective the very crucial and decisive role the House was designed to play and has played in the history of this great country of ours. There is no other history of the House of Representatives that shows the insight and the understanding of this body so well.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this book to my colleagues in the House.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the name of a distinguished resident of the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland has been mentioned on this floor today. Certainly nothing that has been said about Neil MacNeil overemphasizes or exaggerates his fine qualities as a writer.

Neil MacNeil has said that his purpose in writing the "Forge of Democracy" was to "define the House of Representatives."

In so doing he has quoted a number of earlier descriptions of this great body which his animated scholarship has brought to light.

One that caught my eye was that of an 18th-century commentator:

> The design of the House of Representatives is to represent the people of the United States, and to protect their liberties.

In protecting the liberties of the people, this House collectively and its Members individually are often misunderstood. Catcalls, calumny, and caricature are the result. Members are accused of bolshevism on one hand and negative obstructionism on the other. In most cases they are guilty of neither, but have been representing their people in accordance with their conscience and in the light of their experience in life.

Neil MacNeil tells how the House operates and the way in which the Members of this body dedicate themselves to their high calling. The problems of the House are described and analyzed. The achievements of the House in preserving liberty are recorded.

In my judgment, this history of the House will make it at once more human and more understandable, and at the same time more noble and elevated in the opinions of men and women throughout the world.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join my colleagues in praise of Neil MacNeil for his outstanding work "Forge of Democracy." This book is written by a true student of the legislative process who has recorded the actions of the House of Representatives in true form.

The importance of the House is often underestimated by those who do not understand its constitutional powers and its actual operations. Neil MacNeil does with accuracy.

"Forge of Democracy" should be read by each Member of Congress and all Americans who want to have a greater understanding of the body that speaks as the voice of the American people.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to extend their remarks on the subject of Neil MacNeil's book, "Forge of Democracy," at this point in the RECORD; and that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on that subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Neil MacNeil's "Forge of Democracy" is a gripping epic of the House of Representatives. Mr. MacNeil has succeeded in portraying the House as the living, dynamic, political institution that we, as Members, know it to be. It brings to the reader historically accurate information about its membership, past and present, and presents it in a manner that brings each episode to life.

I have known Mr. MacNeil for many years and his book reflects his sincerity and the tremendous effort that he has put into its writing. I congratulate him for making this excellent documentary on the history of the House of Representatives available to the reading public, and to students of government.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have permission to sit until 1 o'clock today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CASTROPHOBIA—A LATIN AMERICAN EPIDEMIC

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the predictions are that a disease seems to be spreading through our sister continent to the south. Castrophobia, a new form of virus, is emanating from Communist Cuba to infect the nations of Latin America. Fidel Castro's disillusioned former administrative aid recently predicted that Communist takeover of Latin America is imminent. Joaquin Ossorio, just arrived in the United States after being freed through arrangements of lawyer James Donovan last week, said in Miami that "Mexico will go first, Cuba will be the base, and the takeover has been prepared there."

Ossorio continued by saying that he did not believe the United States could stop the Communists even if they tried. Americans know better.

Mr. Speaker, how fortunate we are in the United States to be privileged to live in a stable society, with government chosen and upheld in systematic order. This fact comes to us clearly today, May 1, Law Day. Yet to the south, many nations of Latin America are in comparative chaos. Life and property there are protected by law at one moment, are subject to destruction the next.

Mr. Speaker, Law Day brings to every American the responsibility to honor and strengthen the system under which we live. Law Day should cause our Government to examine the responsibility it has to the governed. And Law Day points up the great need for this Nation to exercise its responsibility for leadership in this hemisphere to stem the tide of communism in Latin America.

BLACKOUT ON CRIME NEWS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, for almost a year now I have raised the issue on the floor of this House of the high incidence of crime in the District of Columbia and the impossibility for people in the District or their visiting friends to walk the streets of the District either day or night, for fear of their lives.

I am calling the attention of the Committee on the District of Columbia to this situation. They are now holding hearings on legislation to try to correct it. I am wondering how many of us recognize that within the last 10 days, as they have gone through the Washington newspapers, they have found absolutely no record of the crime in the District of Columbia. It has been blacked out of the newspapers. I find on just a little investigation that the Police Department is being prevented from issuing this information to the press. The Committee on the District of Columbia should be investigating, and if they are not I hope they will, investigate this crackdown on the Police Department to keep this important news out of the newspapers. When you talk about managing the news, they have got it right here in the District of Columbia so far as the Police Department is concerned. I think it is a crime that that news is being blacked out of the newspapers. I am surprised the press has not said something about it.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 35]

Aspinall	Healey	Roosevelt
Beermann	Hébert	Ryan, Mich.
Buckley	Leggett	St. Onge
Celler	Lennon	Scott
Chenoweth	Lloyd	Shelley
Conte	Miller, Calif.	Sisk
Davis, Tenn.	Nedzi	Staebler
Dawson	Powell	Van Pelt
Edmondson	Reid, Ill.	Walter
Flynt	Rivers, Alaska	White
Forrester	Rivers, S.C.	Willis
Hagan, Ga.	Rogers, Colo.	
Hansen	Rogers, Tex.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 396 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT EXTENSION

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 325 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3872) to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the consideration of the bill H.R. 3872, a bill to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes.

The resolution is an open rule, providing for 2 hours of general debate.

The purpose of the bill is to extend the life of the Export-Import Bank for 5 years, to increase the bank's authorization for insurance and guarantee from $1 to $2 billion, and to increase the limitation on the amount of loans, guarantees, and insurance outstanding at any time from $7 to $9 billion.

Mr. Speaker, when the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, appeared before the Committee on Rules to request a rule on this bill, he stated that he would offer an amendment to the bill which would remove the Treasury borrowing authority for the Export-Import Bank from the bill, and would substitute therefor the provision that annual appropriations would be requested for the lending authority. I have seen the amendment, which is in the nature of a substitute, and it will be offered when the House goes into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the rule.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 325 is a 2-hour open rule. On its adoption the House will consider H.R. 3872, which is a bill to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes.

This bill would, first, extend the life of the Export-Import Bank for 5 years to June 30, 1968; second, increase the lending authority of the Bank by $2 billion; and, third, authorize a $1 billion increase in the exporter insurance program of the Bank.

So far as I know there has only been one point of controversy on this bill. That turns on the point of whether the $2 billion of increased lending authority of the Bank would be financed by back-door borrowing from the Treasury or with appropriated funds.

The chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee in his appearance before the Rules Committee, informed our committee he would offer an amendment when the bill was brought before the House, to subject the provision of funds for the increased lending authority to the appropriations process. I believe that should eliminate the controversy on the bill.

There is general agreement the Export-Import Bank has operated on a sound business basis and that it is a valuable instrument in assisting private financial institutions in financing our foreign trade.

Now it is known, of course, if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] offers an amendment here which he has stated he will do, which eliminates the back-door spending and ties it down to appropriated funds, it can then, of course, go to the other body and the back-door spending language could be inserted back into the bill. Then it will come back over here and there may be a conference and it may be that we would eventually find that language in the bill.

So, in order to make a little history on the rule here today, I would like to ask some questions of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] so that we can determine specifically what his intent is and what his attitude throughout this legislative procedure will be. Would the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] be so kind as to answer a few questions for me?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH of California. My understanding is that you intend to offer an amendment deleting the back-door spending and tie it down to appropriated funds; is that correct?

Mr. PATMAN. It is my plan and purpose and I will offer a substitute to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert language as follows:

In order further to enable the Bank to carry out its objects and purposes under this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed upon an appropriation of funds for that purpose to purchase from time to time such additional obligations as the Bank may issue in an amount not to exceed $2,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time.

Mr. SMITH of California. May I ask the gentleman further: We are aware that if it goes to the other body and it is amended there and the language on back-door spending is put back in, then I wonder what your position will be following that?

Mr. PATMAN. As a conferee I will uphold the position of the House, and I feel it will be the duty and obligation of each of the conferees on the part of the House to assume that attitude and be firm in that position.

Mr. SMITH of California. May I ask if the language is the same as you told me before we started on the rule, then you would be adamant in your position with respect to the position of the House?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right. The gentleman uses the correct word to describe it. We would be adamant in our position.

Mr. SMITH of California. I have been informed by one of the Members on this side that if this bill comes back with that back-door language in it, he would object and send it to the Rules Committee.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, if the other body should be adamant in its position, then we would have no legislation at all. This act expires on June 30. I think this legislation is too important for either side or for any Member not to try to get the act extended, and if we get into an impasse, then we would have to do the best we can after consulting those with whom we should consult and take such action as the leaders and others feel we ought to take.

Mr. SMITH of California. Just one other question, if I may.

One of the Members came to me just a short while ago and stated to me that he had heard information or a rumor to the effect that the Export-Import Bank has just recently concluded a loan to Communist Yugoslavia. Are you aware of anything like that?

Mr. PATMAN. No, I am not aware of it.

Mr. SMITH of California. I wonder if this information is brought to your at-

tention, if you will have your committee check into a situation like that.

Mr. PATMAN. That would be something that is up to the executive branch of the Government, I would assume. What kind of a loan is involved, if any? Is it possibly a loan that the gentleman from California might agree with? I do not know just what it might be.

Mr. SMITH of California. I just do not happen to believe that the Export-Import Bank should be lending money to Communist Yugoslavia which is out to take over our Government. I would like to have somebody check that particular situation to see if it exists.

Mr. PATMAN. Generally, I am opposed to doing any business with any Communist country, but it is conceivable if the executive branch of the Government in looking after the foreign affairs of our Government believes that loans should be made under certain conditions that would help the United States of America, then perhaps we might look at the thing in a different light.

Mr. SMITH of California. I thank the gentleman.

As far as I know, if the back-door spending is eliminated, and there are some 13 Members who signed the minority report stating that was their objection, the suggested amendment here will clear up that objection. There is no objection to the rule.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3872) to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 3872, with Mr. LANDRUM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, the purposes of H.R. 3872 are not in controversy.

One purpose is to extend the life of the Export-Import Bank of Washington. Under present law the life of the Bank expires on June 30 of this year. The bill would extend the life of the Bank for another 5 years, or until June 30, 1968.

The second purpose of the bill is to enlarge the Bank's lending, insurance and guarantee authority. At present the Bank is limited to $7 billion of loans and other obligations it can have outstanding at any one time. The bill would increase this amount by $2 billion.

Within this increased total obligational authority, the bill would also permit the Bank to have up to $2 billion outstanding in the form of guarantees and insurance for export credit. At present the Bank is limited to $1 billion for this particular program.

Our committee heard representatives of large and small businesses, representatives of banking, insurance, the AFL–CIO, the Farm Bureau Federation, the National Cotton Council of America, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and others. All witnesses were in support of the proposal to extend the life of the Bank and increase its financing authority.

EXIMBANK HAS GOOD RECORD

The Export-Import Bank has made an extremely good record. It has been in existence now for more than 29 years. It has helped American business firms finance their exports abroad, and it has thus helped these firms make sales they otherwise would not have been able to make. These exports have also helped many underdeveloped countries of the world advance their economic development. The Bank has thus stimulated trade, all parties to which have benefited.

Over most of the life of the Bank, it has been engaged in making what are called project loans. These are loans to some foreign government or private enterprise, or to some American company operating abroad to develop facilities such as harbors, railroads, or factories. In these instances, the loans are made to the recipient country, or company, on the condition that U.S. business firms supply the materials, equipment and services which go into the project. Almost all of these funds are required to be spent in the United States. Only in exceptional cases, where some incidental part of a project is best secured from other sources, may any of the loan funds be spent other than in the United States. Such project loans involve credit of a rather long-term nature.

In view of our acute balance-of-payments problem, Congress in 1961 enacted legislation expanding the Bank's guarantee and insurance authority, to enable the Bank to institute a program of export credits and guarantees. Such export credits and guarantees cover the whole range of commodity exports and usually involve credit of a rather short-term nature.

Over the years that the Bank has been in operation it has paid its administrative expenses, paid for the cost of its money and still made a profit.

The Bank is capitalized with $1 billion of stock, which is owned by the U.S. Treasury. The Bank has paid Treasury dividends on this stock amounting to $206 million. In addition, the Bank has an earned surplus held as a reserve, amounting to $805 million.

For its financial operations, the Bank is authorized to borrow funds from the Treasury—at present up to $7 billion. On the funds borrowed from the Treasury the Bank pays the Treasury an interest rate equal to the Treasury's cost of borrowing 7-year money.

HELPS BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

One point should be emphasized. The operations of the Export-Import Bank do not create any flow of dollars abroad. On the contrary, the dollars which the Bank lends or spends never leave the United States. Its operations are indeed very helpful toward a correction of the deficit in our balance of payments. Last year the Bank's operations made a net contribution of $700 million toward bringing our international payments into balance.

On the basis of the Bank's record and the reliance we are now placing on the Bank to increase our exports and thus help correct our balance-of-payments problem, I believe there should be no objection to extending the life of the Bank and increasing its financing authority.

The Committee on Banking and Currency reported the bill unanimously. Only one objection was made to the bill. This was an objection to the method whereby the Bank is financed.

SO-CALLED BACK-DOOR FINANCING

This objection is to the method by which the Bank has been financed over the last 29 years, which is the so-called back-door spending method.

Because our balance-of-payments problem is an extremely critical one—indeed, a problem which is influencing all of the economic policies of our Government and because delay is inadvisable—I will offer an amendment to the bill to require that the financial operations of the Bank be approved by the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that after this bill had been reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Secretary of the Treasury advised one of the committees of the House that the purposes of this legislation could be accomplished through the appropriations process, it has been decided to recommend the procedure which the gentleman from Texas has just described; is that not correct?

Mr. PATMAN. The majority leader is correct according to my understanding. Since the gentleman mentioned that unfavorable testimony of Secretary Dillon, I will place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, by permission granted when we go back into the House, the actual testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee referred to by the distinguished majority leader of which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] is chairman; and I will also put in the questions and answers.

Our committee on Banking and Currency was strongly in favor of continuing financing in the same manner the Bank has been financed over the 29 years of its life, which is improperly labeled "back-door financing." We were strong for it. Our committee voted the bill out that way. Of course, the Republicans, the minority, voted the other way on that one point. However, they are for the Export-Import Bank. They are for everything except the method of financing.

After we had reported the bill out we discovered that a statement was being circulated to other Members of the House containing this testimony of Secretary Dillon, and our opponents were citing this testimony as a good reason why they could not support the committee's position on what they call back-door financing. Naturally this testimony was very damaging to our cause.

I will insert Mr. Dillon's statement in the RECORD.

SECRETARY DILLON ON THE METHOD OF FINANCING

The following colloquy with Secretary of the Treasury Dillon took place before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives on Treasury-Post Office Departments and Executive Office appropriations for 1964, House of Representatives, 88th Congress, 1st session, page 71.

Secretary Dillon was testifying on February 26, 1963. The hearings were printed on April 1, 1963.

The Committee on Banking and Currency ordered the Export-Import Bank bill (H.R. 3872) reported on February 28, 1963, and the report was filed on March 11, 1963:

EXTENSION OF BACK-DOOR SPENDING OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. GARY. Mr. Secretary, the law under which the Export-Import Bank operates will expire June 30, 1963. I understand that the administration is recommending the extension of that authority for 5 years, together with an increase in capitalization of $2 billion through backdoor spending.

Why could not the increase be in the form of a direct appropriation?

Secretary DILLON. It could.

Mr. GARY. My guess would be that the administration would have a much easier time getting it through if they would make it that way. Last year similar action was taken in connection with the International Monetary Fund, and that increase in capitalization was ultimately made by direct appropriation rather than by backdoor spending.

I see no reason why this could not be done in the same way, and I think you would have lots less opposition to it.

Secretary DILLON. It could. We were responsible in the Treasury for the IMF appropriation, and, although we initially thought it would be easiest to do it in the way that it had always been done in the past, which was by borrowing authority, when we observed the feeling of the Congress, we figured it would be just as easy to do it the other way, and we did it. We got the appropriation, and it went just as well.

The Export-Import Bank is, of course, not under the Treasury, and they had some discussion of this, which way to go. Over the past 25 years, they had received their funds through this borrowing authority. I think they consulted with the chairman of the committee, and he seemed to feel they ought at least initially start that way. He seemed to think that preferable.

Mr. GARY. The chairman of which committee?

Secretary DILLON. Of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House.

Mr. GARY. He probably does not realize that there are a great many of the Members of the Congress that have resolved that they are not going to vote for any more backdoor spending.

Secretary DILLON. That may be. The answer is that we have to get the Export-Import Bank's charter extended. We cannot allow it to die on the 30th of June, and I think they need the new funds. I think they can convince an Appropriations Committee as well as the authorizing committee, and I think, in one way or another, they will have to get their new funds.

Mr. GARY. Personally, I think the Export-Import Bank has done a good job.

Secretary DILLON. Yes; I think it has.

Mr. GARY. And I would like to vote for the increased capitalization, but I am one of those opposed to backdoor spending.

Secretary DILLON. You may well have the chance to vote for the appropriation for them a little later on.

Mr. PASSMAN. Are they running out of authority, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. GARY. The law expires.

Secretary DILLON. It has always been a dated law and expires about every 5 years, and they do have to go to the Banking and Currency to get it extended. That is a regular thing. It just happens to be coming up.

Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed in the position Mr. Dillon attributed to me. It is to the effect that he thought the Bank officials consulted with me and I was only tentatively and moderately in favor of continuing the Bank's 29-year method of financing. The suggestion is that I was just going to offer this method as a feeler, and if it ran into opposition, I would back down.

Well, I never felt that way about any issue in my life, and certainly not about this particular issue. I have always been strong for the Treasury method of financing because it has been successful and, by all logic, is the method best suited to the Bank. I regret that anyone who conferred with me, or that Mr. Dillon in conferring with me, got that impression. I certainly did not intend to leave such an impression that I was not strong and insistent upon the position of the Treasury method as we have had it over the last 29 years.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Am I correct in assuming that the extension and the increased borrowing authority of the Export-Import Bank would still prohibit the making of loans which would be payable in foreign currencies?

Mr. PATMAN. The Bank has never made loans repayable in foreign currencies, but whether it is prohibited from doing so, I cannot say. I would have to examine it. I do not have the information right before me.

Mr. WAGGONNER. If the gentleman will yield further, I think that is the point that is very vital to this particular legislation, considering some of the controversy involved.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, the object of this legislation does not involve foreign currencies at all. The object of this legislation is to make loans to people here, or to other countries, payable in dollars. The dollars do not leave the United States of America. The goods are purchased and are shipped to the person or firm receiving the loan.

Mr. WAGGONNER. If the gentleman will yield further, loans are made which are repayable in foreign currencies and it is most likely that these dollars would never be made available to the U.S. Government again.

Mr. PATMAN. I think some of the foreign lending agencies like AID and the Development Loan Fund, maybe some of them do that. But if the Export-Import Bank is doing it it is certainly on a very limited scale, if at all; certainly it is not a major consideration.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KILBURN. The answer is no; the loans are repayable in dollars.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In the light of what the gentleman has said about the dollars staying in this country will he explain the necessity for the insurance program? What does it cover?

PROPOSALS OF EXPORT CREDIT INSURANCE

Mr. PATMAN. The insurance program is to cover credit extended for exports, to protect people against certain types of losses.

Mr. GROSS. What people are we encouraging?

Mr. PATMAN. We are encouraging the people who get the loans for the purpose of helping the underdeveloped countries and for other purposes, and to encourage U.S. business to make more export sales.

Mr. GROSS. By people does the gentleman mean Americans, U.S. citizens?

Mr. PATMAN. Some of them are: General Motors, Ford Motor Co.; and some of them are small business concerns.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. I would like to inform the House, in answer to the gentleman's question, that the guarantee program is for the benefit of American citizens and American companies. It gives them guarantees for which they pay a premium. This is to encourage our people our companies, American corporations, American citizens, to export their products abroad in competition with foreign products. We sell them the same guarantees and insurance that foreign countries give to their nationals. This is completely an American program, to foster and to promote American export trade.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman what coverage is provided in this insurance?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. The coverage would vary from case to case. The Export-Import Bank, under the basic statute, has the right to issue guarantees and insurance; and instead of doing it itself it also has the right to reinsure. There is a consortium, or group of insurance companies, private insurance companies, who have gotten together to write this insurance in the first instance for our American exporters. They take the reinsurance for which they pay a premium, from the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. GROSS. To guarantee against what?

Mr. MULTER. Against political risk, and guarantee against credit risk. They have two kinds of insurance which will guarantee them against loss, because a foreign country may confiscate their property or their money.

Second, there is the credit risk. It is simple credit insurance, the same as you can get here at home. If you are extending credit, you can buy credit insurance. This is the same kind, except that our private insurance companies issue it to the American exporter and those insurance companies get reinsurance from the Export-Import Bank under their basic insurance, for which they pay.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman for the explanation.

BANKERS AND BUSINESSMEN SUPPORTED TREASURY FINANCING

Now, in offering this amendment to change the method of financing the Bank, I am frank to say that the objection to the method whereby the Bank has been financed over the last 29 years was not raised by any banker or businessman or any other witness who testified before the committee. We had tremendous opposition, true, but only from certain Members of the House.

Members of the House presented a petition—I believe the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] was chairman of a group of 70 or 80 Members who signed a petition saying that they would not vote for this method of financing. So we had tremendous opposition to this method before Mr. Dillon's testimony. After Mr. Dillon's testimony we lost a lot of support, and I will have to say that it was the conclusion, after much consideration, of the leadership of the House, that we should not insist upon the so-called backdoor method of financing, and that we should yield to the appropriation method because we did not have a reasonable chance of getting the bill through unless we did. So just being practical about it, we had to use what we considered to be commonsense and accept the opposition's method, so we could get the bill through the House, rather than insisting on the method that the polls indicated we could not be successful on.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I want to compliment the gentleman on his commonsense.

Mr. PATMAN. The witnesses before the Banking and Currency Committee felt that the operations of the bank were inherently unsuited to the regular appropriations process, and they gave some cogent reasons why they felt that both confidence in the bank and the efficiency of the bank would be hurt by the appropriations requirement. They gave practical reasons, based on experience with the Bank.

The objection, on the other hand, was raised by certain members of the committee and other Members of Congress who have argued that certain theoretical and tactical advantages would accrue from a change in the method of financing.

It has been made plain by those who object to the Treasury method of financing, furthermore, that they are not objecting in any way to any programs or the operations of the Export-Import Bank. Rather they have said that what they wish to do is to amend each and every authorization bill going through Congress, to require separate approval by the Appropriations Committees.

REASONS FOR OBJECTION TO TREASURY FINANCING

It had seemed to me that since the target of this maneuver is not the Export-Import Bank or the merits of the method by which the bank is financed as this method applies to the bank, but a more general target, it would be much better to put forward the objectives which have been stated in a general resolution to make the policy apply across the board to all programs and agencies.

One of the objectives of this effort to stop so-called backdoor spending is set out in a letter to the committee from the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY]. His letter argues that by stopping the so-called backdoor spending, the House can better foreclose the Senate from initiating financial measures.

It had not seemed proper to me to use this particular piece of legislation for inviting a jurisdictional squabble with the Senate, particularly when the purpose being advanced is not the legislation before us, but a more general strategy.

INEFFICIENCY OF THE CONGRESS

I must also be frank to say that I am concerned with the effects of movements of this kind on the efficiency of the Congress and the ability of the Congress to act. The widespread public criticism being made to the effect that as the years go by Congress stays in session longer and gets less and less done is not to be taken lightly. The criticism can fairly be made that the Congress has established too many bottleneck procedures which tend to assure that it will not act rather than that it will act and act with reasonable promptness to the national needs for action.

Under present arrangements the Export-Import Bank legislation must clear the Committees on Banking and Currency of both the House and the Senate. It must clear the Rules Committee of the House. It must have the approval of the two Houses of Congress; and finally it must be signed by the President.

Eliminating the so-called backdoor spending method means only that the legislation will also have to receive the approval of the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses of Congress; and it means that the legislative program must go through the whole legislative process twice, instead of only once. After the legislation has been approved by the Banking Committees of the two Houses, approved by the two Houses of Congress, and approved by the President, it must then be approved by the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses, approved again by the two Houses of Congress, and signed a second time by the President. In other words, it will take the enactment of two laws instead of one, and nothing else is accomplished.

And of course the officers and executives of the Bank have to spend twice as much time testifying before committees of Congress instead of attending to their duties at the Bank.

It was on the basis of these and other considerations that the Committee on Banking and Currency voted for a bill which would continue the method of financing by which the Bank has been successful over the past 29 years.

As for myself personally, further reflection has not changed my views on this matter. Rather I am offering an amendment to the bill to meet the objection that has been made to the bill in order that this important program may at least receive its first approval. I believe the quicker we act on the legislation the better, so the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses may get their work done, in the hope that the Congress can then act again on the matter before the life of the Bank expires next month, on June 30.

I ask that the substitute be offered immediately following the reading of the first section of the bill. The only material change in the substitute, in fact the only change, is to require the financing to be done through the appropriations method. I assume there will be no fight on the rest of the bill, as no one has opposed the bill except as to the method of financing.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3872. I am especially interested in this bill because of the potential opportunities available to small business to enter into export trade under the programs of the Export-Import Bank.

The House Small Business Committee, of which I serve as chairman, has held recent hearings concerning small business and export trade. At these hearings Mr. Harold F. Linder, President and Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank, appeared before the committee. The testimony submitted thus far certainly indicates that there are real potentials and opportunities for small business in the export trade field. I also think it can be fairly said that the foreign credit risk is more important to small business in export trade than price itself. As a result, the services provided by the Export-Import Bank are peculiarly geared to aid small business.

As set out in Mr. Linder's statement—very ably presented to the committee—the new insurance program initiated by the Export-Import Bank through the Foreign Credit Insurance Association could be of special help to small business.

We were advised by Mr. Linder that during the first year, 150 policies insuring against credit loss or political loss

were issued to small and medium-sized businesses that had never exported before.

We were advised that an applicant has never been turned down for insurance under this program because of smallness.

We were advised that one-fourth of the transactions under the credit guarantee program were for less than $25,000 each.

Under the project loan program there are possibilities for small businesses to participate in the supplying of services and materials for these projects, either through direct contracts or through subcontracts.

Mr. Chairman, such programs as have been instituted by the Export-Import Bank through legislation passed by Congress are more important now to our economy than ever before. With an expanding worldwide economy, with stronger and stiffer competition in world trade, with expanded export trade possibilities, it is absolutely necessary that the United States extend its foreign trade. We brag about free enterprise. Can our free-enterprise system compete with the rising nations of the free world? Can we do less for our business community than the programs furnished by other countries? We must match them or we cannot compete. We must compete because world economic leadership cannot be separated from world political leadership.

This country is at a crossroad where we cannot stand still when it comes to foreign trade. We must either expand our foreign trade—compete in the world markets—or revert to isolationism. The dreams of Cordell Hull are within actual reach and the action we take on the floor of the House today concerning the Export-Import Bank will be of significant importance.

Mr. Chairman, I do not mean to say that everything is being done for small business than can or should be done in this field. In fact, the surface has just been scratched. There is evidence that small businesses are not fully realizing the benefits that are provided through the Export-Import Bank. However, this legislation contains potential for small business that cannot be overlooked.

The programs of the Export-Import Bank can be of material helpfulness to small business—as the services and programs of the Export-Import Bank are fully available to small business.

I strongly support the provisions of H.R. 3872, providing for the extension of the Export-Import Bank and urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I think the chairman of our committee has covered most of the points, but I think I can add a few. In the first place, the Export-Import Bank is run well. It is run for the benefit of the exporters. It helps our trade. It helps business and helps labor. It has been run in such a way as to make money for the Government which is a strange thing to me in these times.

I might add they have disbursed approximately $9 billion in loans of which $5,200 million has been repaid. They have paid interest to the Treasury of $432.5 million. They have paid dividends into the Treasury of $306 million. Their losses over the years have been approximately $100 million or only about 1.1 percent. So that is how they could make a profit and they have confined their loans to hard loans. They take a look at every loan and they do not try to allocate them to countries and they do not try to allocate the loans to industries or to states or anything else. A loan application comes in and they make the loan, if they think the loan is sound. They also make the loan many times in conjunction with banks that participate in the loan. So the whole operation has been an excellent one under Mr. Harold F. Linder and under the previous heads of the Bank.

Our chairman took quite a lot of time, it seems to me, on a dead horse and that is the backdoor spending. I would just like to inform the House that the amendment was offered in the committee by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY] to do away with backdoor spending. We were voted down. Hence, the minority report on this bill. I am delighted the chairman of the committee has seen the light and is now going to offer an amendment for appropriation financing.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, at this time I rise in support of the bill and want to express my confidence in the Export-Import Bank operation. I believe over a period of years they have, through their program and operation, shown a consistently fine operating record. It is one group organized by our Government that is a distinct credit to the people of America. As to the new credit guarantee program that is just getting off to a start, I regret at the hearings we did not have any testimony from exporters who are involved in the program. We have been assured that later on this year, an opportunity for hearings will be given so that exporters may come in with their suggestions, criticisms, and constructive ideas, as to the program and its operation today. This can be helpful in formulating policy for the future. I urge the House to support this program. I, too, am happy that the backdoor spending will be eliminated by the amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. I think the gentleman is not correct in his statement that we did not hear exporters at the hearings. We heard some of the biggest exporters in the United States and they testified. Their testimony is in the printed hearings. I believe you will find them, if you examine the record.

Mr. WIDNALL. I think we had testimony from those who financed the exporting to a large extent but not from the exporters themselves. I just hope we can bring them before us in the near future.

Mr. PATMAN. Now, we had the statement of Mr. John O. Yeasting, vice president and general manager, Transport Division of Boeing Aircraft.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am still at sea with respect to the loan guarantee operation. I would like to address a question or two to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Now, is this the insurance program or, let me put it this way, do we have one insurance program for all of these international lending agencies, or does the Export-Import Bank have its own insurance program?

Mr. MULTER. Under the Export-Import Bank Act there are provisions which authorize the Export-Import Bank to set up an insurance and guarantee program, which it has done, and I think what the gentleman from New Jersey, [Mr. WIDNALL], was referring to is the fact that this is a new program; it is just getting off the ground, and we, in the committee, have not yet had an opportunity to inquire into its complete operation. We have not been quite satisfied that they are moving fast enough, but having in mind that it is a new operation, we cannot push them into something that will cause tremendous losses. But, our committee does want to review that entire program as it is presently operating to make sure that it is operating at its full effectiveness for the benefit of our American exporters.

Mr. GROSS. Is this an adaptation of the program that has been in effect several years, dealing with the mutual security program?

Mr. MULTER. No.

Mr. GROSS. Forget the mutual security program; let me say other international lending agencies.

Mr. MULTER. Under your so-called mutual security and foreign aid bills there has been an insurance program that has been operating quite apart from this program. This is a new program that the Export-Import Bank has always been authorized to implement but has only recently implemented.

Mr. GROSS. Do you guarantee against civil strife, rebellion, insurrection, and all the coverages of the other programs?

Mr. MULTER. If civil strife, civil insurrection, and rebellion can come within the definition of political risk, yes. The Export-Import Bank is authorized to insure against damage, political risk, which takes in any action by a foreign government which would make it impossible for the American to receive payment of his debt.

That is the political risk. In addition to that, they have the right to insure and are insuring against the credit risk, which is the ordinary credit insurance as we know it here at home.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to see someone undertake to explain this matter. This is a real sugar-coated pill, these words "political risk."

Mr. MULTER. Let us be sure we understand this.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. MULTER. This must be operated on a financially sound basis.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, I do not question that.

Mr. MULTER. They set up a premium schedule and the premiums in their judgment must be enough to pay for the losses.

Mr. GROSS. I am not questioning the soundness of it. I am pointing to the euphemy that is being used. In one guarantee program the coverages are set out and defined as insurrection, riots, civil strife, revolution, convertibility of currency, expropriation, and so on and so forth. I am surprised that the State Department did not dream up political risks instead of laying it out in words that one can understand. "Political risk" covers the waterfront, does it not?

Mr. MULTER. Of course, it can cover the waterfront, but I am sure it is delineated in the statute so that it does not cover the waterfront.

Mr. GROSS. The dollars advanced under this program stay in this country?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Under the loans made through the Export-Import Bank the dollars stay in this country?

Mr. MULTER. The money is usually used for purchases here at home.

Mr. GROSS. So, the guarantee is to what in the foreign country? Is it to the machinery that has been shipped over and not paid for, for instance?

Mr. MULTER. Let us not confuse the two. You, first, have your loan program.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. MULTER. Your loan program is a loan made by the Export-Import Bank to the American exporter who is selling his goods abroad and cannot finance his sale unless he gets the money when he is ready to make delivery.

Mr. GROSS. He is guaranteeing what? His money?

Mr. MULTER. There is no guarantee involved when the Export-Import Bank makes a loan to you or to me as an exporter. That is it. When we make delivery to whomever we are selling—to the foreign country, or an individual in the foreign country—we get our money against our documents and then the money will eventually be repaid. That is quite apart from the guarantee insurance program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman from New York yield me an additional 5 minutes?

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me on that point?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I think under the existing law, in fact, I know that all political risk is carried—all political risk is guaranteed and insured.

Mr. GROSS. All political risk is guaranteed?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right; and 50 percent of the commercial risk. Mr. Linder testified that they are working with the insurance companies to the end that very soon they will have full commercial risk insurance. I think there is pretty good coverage now. Based upon a lot of experience which they have had, all of the political risk and 50 percent of the commercial risk will be covered.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is referring to the guarantee and insurance program. There are no guarantees and insurance concerned when the loan is made by the Export-Import Bank to an American exporter. That is one deal. The loan is made and that it is. He does not need any guarantees any longer.

Mr. GROSS. I did not think so.

Mr. MULTER. That would be the Export-Import Bank which would be looking for the guarantee and it would have to look for the guarantee from whoever agreed to pay the debt, which would be the individual in a foreign country or, the foreign company. Before they make that loan they must be sure this is a sound loan and there is reasonable assurance of repayment. That is part of the inquiry which the Bank must make before making the loan. When the loan is made, that transaction is at an end except to await repayment.

The guarantee and insurance program was entered into in an effort to try to take the Export-Import Bank out of the lending program as far as possible, and instead of making a loan to you or to me in the first instance, as a result of which we got our money and shipped our goods abroad, instead of that you or I would go to the local bank or the Export-Import Bank and say "We want to sell this merchandise to John Jones, or whatever his name is in a foreign country, or to a foreign country."

This is guaranteed, No. 1, against political risk, and No. 2, against the credit risk for which we are paying a premium, and you or I selling this merchandise may not want the credit risk. We may determine that if we got a guarantee against political risk that is enough, and we will not buy that insurance, but if we want a credit coverage we will buy that.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that particular operation. Now, before my time expires I want to get into another phase of this business. The gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], in presenting the rule on the bill, spoke of the loan to Yugoslavia. I have in hand a letter signed by Mr. Harold F. Linder, President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, saying, and I will read briefly from it:

> Following discussions which began early in 1960 under the leadership of the International Monetary Fund, the Yugoslav Government in the fall of 1960 requested financial assistance from the Export-Import Bank. On February 16, 1961, the Export-Import Bank authorized a credit (credit No. 1461) to the Government of Yugoslavia in the amount of $50 million to assist in financing the acquisition in the United States and exportation to Yugoslavia of materials, machinery, equipment and related services, all of U.S. origin, necessary for the economic development of Yugoslavia.

In the interests of time, I shall not read further from the letter. It is incredible to me that the Export-Import Bank should be extending any credit for the benefit of Communist Yugoslavia for the purpose of—although this letter does not so state—but as I understand it, for the construction of tankers in Yugoslavia for the Soviet Government.

Mr. MULTER. I would doubt that this loan or any part of it was being used for military equipment.

Mr. GROSS. I said tankers; not tanks.

Mr. MULTER. If these tankers are used in connection with the economics of the country, in connection with industry, then I think it could very well and properly be considered a good loan.

Mr. GROSS. I am not questioning whether it is a good financial risk or a bad one. I am questioning the principle of the Export-Import Bank extending credits for the benefit of Yugoslavia under any conditions.

Mr. MULTER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. MULTER. Political considerations are the determination of the State Department. Any time the Export-Import Bank wants to make a loan to a foreign country it must clear with the State Department first. It may not make a loan to any of our enemies, and it may not make a loan even to our allies or to any one of our friendly allies, unless the State Department on the basis of political considerations says it is all right.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not consider Yugoslavia to be a friendly ally, does he?

Mr. MULTER. This is not my determination; this is the determination of the State Department. If this loan has been approved by the Export-Import Bank it is only because the State Department said that it is all right.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. STINSON].

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] a question. As the bill is constituted is there nothing in it to prevent this money from being loaned to a Communist country?

Mr. GROSS. So far as I know, that is right. I was amazed to find out that the Export-Import Bank was making loans to Yugoslavia.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Texas if any precautions have been taken to insure that there is no money loaned from these funds to Communist countries?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not familiar with what the gentleman said about the Yugoslavian loan, but certainly we do not want anything to happen that would be against the interests of the United States. We do not want these loans used to help any Communist country. If a loan can be used in aid of the United States in its program for peace, naturally we want that done. But I do not understand what the loan is for; but it will be looked into. It is certainly not the intention to make a loan to any Communist country against the interests of the United States.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Texas think it would

be appropriate to write an amendment of that kind into the bill?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think we should write it into the act unless we have clear cases of abuse. Just the mention of a loan I do not think proves that we have had an abuse. We should make sure that we do not go to any extreme to cripple this fine agency, without some proof of wrongdoing.

We have no proof of wrongdoing. All our proof is that it is doing well, doing fine. I believe the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] brought out a fear that there was a proposed law to increase it to the tune of about $50 million. I believe that does provide some funds. But he did not give us any details about it. I do not know what they are, but I am going to look into it.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I think the answer that the gentleman is seeking is in the Export Control Act, where all exports come under Government scrutiny and certain types of exports are subject to license, and some are subject to general licenses. So I would think that the State Department would scrutinize very carefully any type of item that was financed by this type of legislation, and not approve any exports of military significance that went to a Communist country.

Mr. STINSON. Does the State Department make a practice of authorizing any kind of loans to Communist countries?

Mr. PELLY. I think the policy of our country and our State Department is to encourage trade with Yugoslavia, but they try to discourage or put an embargo on anything that has military significance. I do not agree with the determinations they make in this respect, but they do scrutinize them.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the gentleman that the Export-Import Bank is an independent agency and it has a distinguished advisory committee consisting of some of the most distinguished industrial and financial leaders in the entire United States. Let me read the names of those comprising this advisory committee:

Carl J. Gilbert (chairman of committee), chairman of the board, the Gillette Co., Gillette Park, Boston, Mass.

Dr. James A. McCain, president, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kans.

Gustav Riedlin, consultant, George Fry & Associates, Inc., 3540 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

Michael Ross, director, International Affairs Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

William R. Biggs, vice president, the Bank of New York, 48 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

George H. Chittenden, vice president, Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., 23 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

David M. Kennedy, chairman of the board, Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, Lock Box H 90, Chicago, Ill.

Wilfred McNeil, president, Grace Line, Inc., 3 Hanover Square, New York, N.Y.

Philip W. Pillsbury, chairman of the board, the Pillsbury Co., Pillsbury Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

I do not believe our Export-Import bank officials or these gentlemen would be a party to permitting loans to be made that would be against the interest of the United States. I do not believe that they would be a party to permitting the Export-Import Bank to make loans for the purpose of helping a Communist country. Therefore I do not think it would be necessary to write any amendment into the act with regard to it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, my concern is with the substitute that will be offered to the bill which is under consideration. Frankly, I deplore the capitulation which is reflected by the substitution of new legislation for the original bill which was reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

In my opinion, and I think most people will concur, the use of Federal funds by the Export-Import Bank has not warranted a need for changing the means by which the affairs of the Bank are funded. The Export-Import Bank has handled its business expeditiously, efficiently, and properly. The business of the Bank is big business and for the primary benefit of business and domestic employment. It is only with great reluctance that I go along with the substitute, which reflects improperly, I think, on the activities of the Bank, which have been so favorably established in the testimony before the committee and in its records.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, when our distinguished colleague, the honorable gentleman from Texas, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, first introduced the proposed bill, H.R. 3872, it was so done on the assumption that the Export-Import Bank would be authorized by the Congress to borrow the additional fund of $2 billion needed from the Treasury on a debt transaction without the necessity of Congress appropriating those funds. This has been the traditional method used to finance the Bank ever since it was first created by this Congress in 1945 as an independent agency of the Government. This method of financing has proved over the years to be excellently suited to the operations of the Bank, as evidenced by laws enacted by this Congress at regular intervals in order to successively increase the funds and scope of activity of the Bank.

I am, therefore, somewhat apprehensive at the present move by some Members of this Congress to change this procedure for that of annual appropriation process, in spite of the unanimity of feeling in this House that the Bank has conducted its business always in an exemplary manner and has achieved substantial success in its basic objective of promoting foreign trade of this country. This change of procedure is being advocated on the contention that whenever an agency's spending is not subject to the kind of annual congressional review required by the appropriations process, the fiscal fate of the Nation is endangered or in doubt.

In the case of the Export-Import Bank, however, as in all Government corporations, annual scrutiny and financial control of its operations are already being carried out by the Congress under the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act. In accordance with the provisions of the act, a wholly owned Government corporation, such as the Export-Import Bank, is required to submit an annual budget program containing a statement of financial condition, a statement of income and expense, an analysis of surplus or deficit, a statement of sources and application of funds, and estimates of operations for the current and ensuing fiscal years including estimates of administrative expenses, borrowings and the amount of capital funds which shall be returned to the Treasury during the fiscal year, or appropriations required to provide for restoration of capital impairments. These budget programs as modified, amended or revised by the President are then transmitted to Congress as a part of the annual budget. After reviewing these programs, Congress may enact whatever legislation it deems necessary to increase or limit the appropriations or funds available for operating and administrative expenses of such a corporation.

I should like to point out another significant facet of congressional control over the operations of such a corporation. It is the requirement of an annual audit by the General Accounting Office. The audit includes such comments and information as may be necessary to keep Congress informed of the operations and financial condition of the corporation, together with any recommendations with respect to it that the Comptroller General may deem advisable. The Comptroller General is also required to note specifically any program, expenditure, financial transaction or undertaking which, in his opinion, has been carried on or made without authority of law.

I have taken the liberty of enumerating the checks and controls as above in detail in the hope of emphasizing that under existing law there is sufficient scrutiny over such Government corporations, such as the Export-Import Bank, that are financed by obligational authority on a debt transaction, without the necessity of going through the appropriations process.

I would like to advance some of the following considerations which I believe support my concern over a change in the method of financing the operations of the Bank which have been followed since its founding.

First, if the Bank's funds are made available by appropriation there is danger that the Bank will experience pressure to program its lending each year by type of financing, or by areas, or by countries. Thus an appropriation of funds might well lead the American exporting community to expect the Bank

to lend its entire appropriation in a given period regardless of the merits of the transactions submitted to it. Among borrowing countries there might be similar pressures that the Bank set quotas and consume the appropriated funds irrespective of the needs or soundness of the projects for which financing is sought. The Bank has never programed its funds in this manner. Rather, it employs its funds as needed to conduct its operations. I believe this to be a sound way to operate the Bank—any bank—and the Bank's experience convinces me that it is imperative to avoid the implication that any segment of American industry or geographical area of the world has any claim on the Bank for a certain volume of loan funds per year.

Second, as a corollary of the preceding argument, I believe that it is the desire of all concerned to distinguish the loans of the Export-Import Bank from the activities of the Agency for International Development. This point, of course, is not made in derogation of that Agency nor its activities. However, it is accepted that the Bank is the "hard" lending agency of the United States and that its purpose is to finance our foreign trade. If the Bank is forced to go the appropriation route after the Congress, upon recommendation of the Banking and Currency Committees, authorizes an increase in its funds there is the added danger that the Bank's activities will be linked to those of the Agency for International Development.

Thirdly, traditionally the Bank, operating upon an obligational authority rather than appropriated funds, has been able to meet emergencies by extending legitimate assistance to a foreign country which is a good customer of the United States when foreign exchange difficulties have threatened to impede or curtail that country's normal level of imports from the United States. Our experience with Canada last year is illustrative. In June, in cooperation with the International Monetary Fund and the Treasury Department, the Bank established a $400 million line of credit for Canada. That Government was able to reestablish its balance-of-payments position without any drawings on our line of credit and subsequently requested that the line be canceled; $250 million being canceled in August and the remainder in December of last year. The Bank was compensated for this tieup of its funds under the line of credit by charging Canada a modest, but adequate, one-quarter of 1 percent commitment fee on the unutilized funds for the periods involved. Emergency requirements of this kind frequently used for only short periods cannot be anticipated. To meet them is required a substantial reservoir of uncommitted lending authority.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, many distinguished Members of the Congress in both Houses have spoken eloquently on the practicality of the traditional method of financing such agencies as the Bank in comparison to the appropriations process. I wish to quote here for the benefit of this House an extract of a statement made in July 1959 by the distinguished Republican from Indiana, the Honorable Homer E. Capehart, made in the course of a debate on the financing of the Development Loan Fund, but which has definite relevance to our present deliberations:

I want to talk about the practical aspect of the matter, not whether the Federal Government should or should not lend money. The practice of authorizing the Treasury to lend money has developed as a result of Congress authorizing or passing laws to enable the Federal Government to lend money to many different kinds of projects.

For example, there are two kinds of expenditures at the moment in the Federal Government. One is expenditures for business purposes, expenditures which we would call expenses. In other words, the money is spent 100 percent as expenses.

In the case of a bank, a bank lends money and expects to get the money back. It lends the money out of its treasury, and the loans are repaid to the treasury * * *.

When we authorize the Treasury to lend money for a specific purpose, such as the Export-Import Bank, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the International Bank, and a half a dozen housing projects, we do not know whether the money will be lent in 1 year or over a longer period of time.

Therefore, if we appropriate $1 billion, and there is a request for only $500 million to be loaned, then there is $500 million in an appropriation bill which will not be used.

I think we would be much better off to authorize the Treasury to lend money in instances when the money will be repaid to the Treasury, than we would to go the appropriation route. I think we ought to have all the safeguards that we can possibly get with reference to authorizations for the Treasury to lend money for specific purposes.

As a practical business matter, there would be better control over the funds and over the money if the Treasury were authorized to lend money to the corporations or the institutions to which the loans are to be made, than by the appropriation route, in my opinion.

If we appropriate the money, the attitude will be taken that it is appropriated and will be gone. But since we are going to lend money which will be repaid and we are going to have collateral—a note or some other sort of instrument—it seems to me, purely from a business standpoint and a practical standpoint that it would be better to go that route than the appropriation route.

I myself would favor a rule which provided that when money has been expended and the Government never expects it to be returned, such funds be considered by the appropriation route.

When the money is to be lent, and we expect it to be returned when the loans are repaid to the Treasury, I think it would be wiser to go to the other route. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 10, pp. 12440–12441.)

Now the gentleman whom I have quoted—was and is not exactly a "flaming liberal" on economic matters, but he is an individual whose commonsense and business sense tells him that there must be some exceptions to the "traditional financing." Particularly, he sees that where money is to be lent, he feels that "it would be wiser to go the other route"—that is, authorizing the Treasury to lend.

I now wish to invite your attention to another quotation of an extract of a statement made on the same occasion by the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON, the Senator from Missouri:

If the Development Loan Fund is to be an efficient and effective program, its administrators must know what funds will be available for loans over a period of several years. It often takes a considerable period of time to develop a loan project and the lending authority must be assured that funds will be in the till when the project is finalized.

Moreover, it is highly desirable for foreign nations to know what the program is. There would be a tangible demonstration of America's intention to help these lesser developed countries now in the process of an industrial take-off.

It is also necessary to help them lay plans for economic development.

I believe that these conditions can only be achieved by financing the Development Loan Fund on a banking basis, like that of the Export-Import Bank and that of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; that is, authorizing the Fund to borrow money from the Treasury over a period of years * * *.

I do not believe that the process of annual appropriations can provide these prerequisites for a successful program.

Our 2 years experience with the Fund demonstrates this clearly. Two years ago the Senate adopted an administration-backed proposal to finance the Fund through a public debt transaction, and to authorize it to lend $2 billion over the next 3 years.

The House of Representatives substantially cut the authorization and insisted on the regular appropriation procedure.

The Mutual Security Act of 1958, as it was finally passed, authorized $1,125 million to be appropriated annually over the next 2 years.

In actual fact, only $850 million has actually been appropriated in 1958 and 1959; and even this sum has only narrowly missed crippling reductions, as witnessed by the House Appropriations Committee report to delete any appropriations for the Fund from the 1959 supplemental appropriation.

The uncertainty which derives from this procedure prohibits the businesslike operation of this business enterprise. Not only does it have the effect of discrediting the Fund in the eyes of the countries which it is designed to help—the annual appropriations hassle is not a very reassuring spectacle to our foreign friends—but it also severely inhibits American negotiations in making contracts.

Paradoxically, it may also have the reverse effect in some cases, and force the hasty conclusion of loans near the end of the year so that the Fund will be in a better position to ask Congress for another appropriation. While it is true that there is no fiscal year limitation on appropriations for the Fund, and hence unused money may be carried over for use in another year, it is a reality of the appropriations procedure that if an agency ends up the year with unused money, its next year's appropriation is very likely to be reduced.

The public debt transaction is a tried and tested institution which has demonstrated its superiority for financing certain types of programs.

Normally, public debt transactions are used for lending programs where the amounts advanced will be loaned on interest.

In the case of the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, this advance represents a capital contribution.

Few would have us believe that the public debt transaction is an evil device insidiously employed only in recent years to bring on the bankruptcy of the United States. This could not be further from the truth. It is a legitimate and valuable method of financing which has been incorporated into

some of our most successful and respected pieces of legislation over the past quarter of a century.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss if I did not mention the contribution Eximbank has made to our balance-of-payments situation. On April 2, 1963, the financial section of the New York Times, in an article entitled "Agencies Report on Ways To Stem Dollar Outflow," reported that the Government has instituted a plan as of last spring to help reduce the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit by compiling a so-called gold budget which required all Government agencies to report all oversea spending and income and set targets for reducing the gap wherever it would not hurt the national interest. The Budget Bureau is said to be in the process of reviewing with each of the agencies concerned the first of what will be quarterly reports. The article mentioned that out of last year's balance-of-payments deficit of $2,200 million, the difference between $34,200 million that flowed out and $32,000 million that flowed in, the Government share of the totals is said to be roughly $5,100 million in outflow and $3,200 million in inflow. In the Committee on Banking and Currency Report No. 86 on the Eximbank Act Extension, I note that the Bank's operations during the calendar year 1962 made a net contribution of $700 million toward bringing our international payments into balance. This is an impressive contribution indeed for Eximbank to have a significant 22 percent of the $3,200 million in the Government share of the inflow in the balance-of-payments totals mentioned.

In recent years, the Export-Import Bank, I understand, has increasingly operated on the basis of guarantee rather than furnishing financing, particularly in its exporter credit and insurance programs. During the past 2 calendar years the Bank has been able to authorize over $3 billion, and, significantly, to disburse $1.6 billion without any net borrowing from the Treasury. This phenomenon is due to the readiness of the commercial banks and other financial institutions to honor the Bank's guarantees in the certain knowledge of the Bank's ability to borrow money from the Treasury on authorization of the Congress without the necessity of it going through an appropriation procedure.

In the Export-Import Bank of Washington, the Congress has one of the most solidly established and respected Government agencies of the United States.

Its position with the banking and business community of the United States and of the free world is largely attributable to the fact that since its inception the Congress has financed its activities by replenishing its funds through the borrowing authority procedure. The Bank today is a critically important instrument for the expansion and promotion of American exports. A change at the present in the manner in which it obtains its funds will not add to congressional control over its operations but may weaken the position of the Bank in dealings with the banking and business communities of the United States and abroad and in its vital function of helping to reduce our international balance-of-payments deficit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 2(c)(1) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 is amended by striking out "$1,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,000,000,000".

(b) Section 6 of such Act is amended by striking out "$6,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$8,000,000,000".

(c) Section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out "$7,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$9,000,000,000".

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That (a) section 2 (c) (1) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 is amended by striking out '$1,000,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$2,000,000,000'.

"(b)(1) Section 6 of such Act is amended by inserting '(a)' immediately after 'SEC. 6.'.

"(2) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(b) In order further to enable the Bank to carry out its objects and purposes under this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, upon appropriation of funds for that purpose, to purchase from time to time such additional obligations as the Bank may issue in an amount not to exceed $2,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time.

"'(c) For the purpose of enabling the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase obligations of the Bank pursuant to subsection (b), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated at any time without fiscal year limitation $2,000,000,000, to remain available until expended. Any funds paid to the Treasury by the Bank as repayment on account of the principal of obligations purchased as provided in subsection (b) shall continue to be available for the purchase of additional obligations by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (b).

"'(d) Each obligation issued by the Bank to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the provisions of subsection (b) shall be governed as to interest and maturity by the provisions of subsection (a). Payment of interest by the Bank on account of any obligations purchased under subsection (b) shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.'

"(c) Section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out '$7,000,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$9,000,000,000'.

"SEC. 2. Section 8 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1963' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1968'."

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said here today on the subject of this back-door spending. Since this is the amendment that pertains to that subject, I would just like to make these few brief remarks.

The amendment offered by the chairman of the committee is most unusual. It strikes out all of the committee reported bill and substitutes an amendment offered by the chairman as a complete substitute for the bill reported by the committee. It is not a committee amendment as no meeting of the committee has been called to approve the amendment. It is a most unusual procedure.

However, Mr. Chairman, I wish to assure the Members of this House, the amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of our committee is all right. What it does is strike out all of the reported bill and then restate, unchanged, the provisions of the reported bill relating to extension of the life of the Bank, increase in its lending authority, increase in its exporter credit insurance program and in addition changes the method of financing the increase in lending authority from a back door to an appropriated fund basis.

This last mentioned change; namely, the requirement for appropriations, is the only change made by the chairman's amendment. And that change, except for the nonconsequential substitution of the word "that" for "such," and the insertion of the word "thereof" is verbatim the language of the amendment I offered in committee to require that funds for the increased lending authority be provided through the appropriation process. For the RECORD, I submit the exact text of my amendment: On the first page, strike out lines 6, 7, and 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b)(1) Section 6 of such Act is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 6.".

(2) Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

"(b) In order further to enable the Bank to carry out its objects and purposes under this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, upon appropriation of funds of said purpose, to purchase from time to time such additional obligations as the Bank may issue in an amount not to exceed $2,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time.

"(c) For the purpose of enabling the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase obligations of the Bank pursuant to subsection (b), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated at any time without fiscal year limitation $2,000,000,000, to remain available until expended. Any funds paid to the Treasury by the Bank as repayment on account of the principal of obligations purchased as provided in subsection (b) shall continue to be available for the purchase of additional obligations by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (b).

"(d) Each obligation issued by the Bank to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the provisions of subsection (b) shall be governed as to interest and maturity by the provisions of subsection (a). Payment of interest by the Bank on account of any obligations purchased under subsection (b) shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. Chairman, in a speech on the floor of the House on April 3, 1963, I made clear that it would come as no surprise to me to have my amendment taken away from me. I stated and I quote:

I full well realize, Mr. Speaker, that I may be denied the opportunity of offering this amendment purely because under parliamentary procedure a member of the majority may be recognized to offer the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, no matter how this amendment is camouflaged and irrespective of the unusual procedure utilized to bring it before this body, the fact re-

mains that what it does is conform the bill to the position taken by the Republican members of the Banking and Currency Committee. I support the amendment. It should be adopted.

The fact remains this is the amendment that was offered by the Republican minority.

May I also say, in response to remarks of some of the distinguished members of the committee on the other side of the aisle, who have been critical that back-door spending has now been taken out of this bill, that this action reflects a concern among many of us in the House over the deficits that this administration has been responsible for, not that they are peculiar to one administration or another, but this administration has been responsible for during the last 3 years. We are greatly concerned about the fact we are now headed for the first time into an era of planned deficits. Very frankly, we regard this sort of thing as loose financial practice, as we set forth in our minority views. It is for that reason I believe it should be taken out.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. I am in the process of preparing a study of the financial statements of the 200 largest corporations of the United States. I expect to show where a good part of the deficits started. It started from the investment credit bill which we passed last year. I will be able to pinpoint the dollars and cents of the tax losses to the Treasury because of this one item. It also stems from the depreciation schedules adopted last spring which took millions of dollars out of the Federal Treasury and put it into the black-ink ledgers of the 200 largest corporations of the country. I can explain where a great part of the deficit has been created. It has been created in order to stimulate a better atmosphere for business in the country. We can replace a good part of that deficit.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. The gentleman may be sure I will look forward to the study. On the subject of back-door spending, I think the administration itself recognizes the validity of the use of the appropriation process for they use the Budget Bureau in connection with governmental expenditures from the administrative end. It seems to me that it makes good sense, in that we do the same thing here in the use of the Appropriations Committee in the legislative process.

I wholeheartedly support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to substitute financing the Export-Import Bank through the regular appropriations process rather than by back-door borrowing authority as contained in H.R. 3872.

On February 25, 1963, I filed with the House Committee on Banking and Currency a joint letter on behalf of myself and a group of 85 other Members of the House expressing our opposition to the back-door provisions of this legislation to increase the Export-Import Bank's obligational authority. In this letter we urged that financing be done through the usual appropriations process and we noted that significant progress had been made in eliminating back-door spending practices in that only 2 such bills were enacted in the 2d session of the 87th Congress containing borrowing authority of only $437 million in contrast to the previous 1st session when the executive requests of 11 such bills totaled in excess of $28 billion and of which more than $19 billion was enacted into law.

Mr. Chairman, discontinuance of financing programs through legislative borrowing authority clearly enhances the opportunity to legislate in a more responsible and orderly manner within a framework of competitive priorities. Especially is the question important to the maintenance by the House of its historic prerogatives and supremacy in money matters. The other body through the years has indulged heavily in originating back-door spending bills.

In support of this amendment, Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that when other programs similar to the Export-Import Bank which were previously funded through the back-door method of borrowing from public debt receipts were changed to the appropriations procedure it has been effected without any disruption. For example, last year the President was supplied through the usual legislative authorization—Public Law 87–490—and appropriation method—Public Law 87–872—with $2 billion additional subscription to the International Monetary Fund. As I say the U.S. participation heretofore had been by public debt authority carried in a legislative bill and this change in method of funding for the International Monetary Fund was recommended by the executive branch and the Committee on Banking and Currency. Certainly, there is no reason against a similar change for the Export-Import Bank, where its operating budget is already subject to annual review and approval in regular appropriations bills.

A similar example is the Small Business Administration where additional loan capital is supplied as necessary through the regular appropriation bills. So, Mr. Chairman, as I say, with significant progress having been made by the House in restoring fiscal control to the Congress by way of the appropriation procedure in lieu of direct public debt expenditure authority, I hope this amendment is unanimously adopted.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I am impelled to urge at this time that the House take this action in firm resolve to return the funding of all programs to the appropriation process where there is assurance of an annual scrutiny and review by the Appropriation Committee. It is essential in the interest of fiscal responsibility that one committee, and one committee alone, have the heavy responsibility of weighing the need and urgency of each program in relation to other bills and also in respect to the overall condition of the Treasury. By adoption of this amendment the House will stand on principle and comply with the constitutional provision that no money shall be drawn from the Treasury except in consequence of an appropriation made by law. Let the Congress from now on follow this provision of the Constitution and restore to itself control of expenditures which in many cases heretofore it has abrogated to the executive branch and agencies of the Government.

I urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORHEAD. I am sure that the gentleman shares my concern over the international balance-of-payments deficit, and I would hope that the gentleman would support an adequate appropriation by the Committee on Appropriations so that we are sure that the Export-Import Bank will have sufficient funds to take care of any unforeseen contingencies, which will have an important bearing on our balance-of-payments deficit.

Mr. PELLY. May I say to the gentleman I think this Export-Import Bank has been well managed. It is a very important program toward financing our exports, and I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANDRUM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3872) to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 325, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests. First, that all Members have the privilege within 5 days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed; and that the Members who spoke on the bill while the House was in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union may have the privilege of extending

their remarks and also inserting extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to sit tomorrow afternoon while the House is in session during general debate.

Mr. Speaker, I have cleared this with the minority members.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 36]

Aspinall	Fountain	Rivers, S.C.
Barrett	Gray	Rogers, Colo.
Beermann	Hagan, Ga.	Rogers, Tex.
Belcher	Harsha	Roosevelt
Blatnik	Healey	Ryan, Mich.
Buckley	Hébert	Scott
Celler	Holifield	Shelley
Chenoweth	Karth	Sisk
Clark	King, Calif.	Smith, Calif.
Davis, Tenn.	Kluczynski	Thomas
Dent	Lennon	Van Pelt
Diggs	Miller, Calif.	Waggonner
Dowdy	Nedzi	Walter
Flynt	Pepper	Willis
Fogarty	Powell	Wilson,
Forrester	Rivers, Alaska	Charles H.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 371 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AMENDING THE FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS ACT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 312, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5207) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 312 provides for consideration of H.R. 5207, a bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, to authorize additional appropriations for the acquisition of sites and buildings in foreign countries for use by the United States, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The principal purpose of H.R. 5207 is to authorize an appropriation of $26,324,000 for the purchase, construction, major alteration, and long-term leasing of buildings overseas needed by the Department of State in connection with the operation of its 286 posts. The amount authorized in the bill will make available to the Department sufficient funds to carry out the 2-year building program justified to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The bill also authorizes the appropriation of $23,500,000 for the operational activities of the building program such as maintenance, repair, and furnishings. Finally, the bill deletes from existing law all references to the Foreign Service Buildings Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 312.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 312 makes in order the consideration of the bill H.R. 5207. The principal purpose of H.R. 5207 is to authorize an appropriation of $26,324,000 for the purchase, construction, major alteration, and long-term leasing of buildings overseas needed by the Department of State in connection with the operation of its 286 posts. The amount authorized in the reported bill will make available to the Department sufficient funds to carry out the 2-year building program justified to the committee.

The bill also authorizes an appropriation of $23,500,000 for the operational activities of the building program, such as maintenance, repair, and furnishings.

Finally, the bill deletes from existing law all references to the Foreign Service Buildings Commission. The Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended, empowers the Secretary of State to acquire sites and buildings abroad for our diplomatic and consular establishments as well as for representatives of certain other Government agencies. When title to sites and buildings cannot be acquired by purchase, authority is granted to permit the acquisition of leaseholds of not less than 10 years.

The 1926 act authorized an appropriation of $10 million for the building program. Additional authorizations of $1,625,000 in 1936 and of $5 million in 1938 brought the prewar authorizations up to $16,625,000. Appropriations against these authorizations never exceeded $2,700,000 in any one year; usually the appropriations were smaller. From 1936 to 1939, inclusive, no appropriations were made. During the war years the program came to an almost complete standstill.

At the present time the chart shows that there is a division between different localities; that is, Africa, American Republics, Europe, Far East, Near East, and South Asia.

Thus the committee recommends an authorization that is $4,176,000 below the amount requested by the Executive. The Executive asked for $30,500,000 and the committee has cut that by $4,176,000. The largest dollar reduction was made in the program for Africa. Costs often were unreasonably high, the size of the American complement was unusually large, and unsettled internal conditions make it advisable to defer construction at this time. Proposed office buildings for Accra, Ghana; for Ouagadougou, Upper Volta; and for Lome, Togo, were not approved by the committee, although in both Togo and Upper Volta funds were included for the development of sites. In Ghana the office building is adequate for the needs of the Department of State.

The committee recognizes the pressing need for adequate residential and office accommodations in Mogadiscio, Somali, but the unsettled conditions in that part of Africa make it desirable to proceed cautiously with costly construction.

In Latin America the committee expressed its opposition to particular projects in Colombia and Mexicali, Mexico.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, that the committee has been reasonable and has cut where it could. Of course, it is always possible to cut a little more. There seems to have been no dissenting views according to the report. I believe there is no possible objection to the approval of the rule.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I should like to make this one observation. I do not suppose this bill is one that any of us approach with much enthusiasm, because we will probably not receive much accommodation in our respective districts. We are authorizing the expenditure of money for embassies and other facilities in foreign countries. However, I should like to compliment the committee for language they have placed on page 3 of the bill, which I should like to read:

To the maximum extent feasible, expenditures under this act shall be made out of foreign currencies owned by or owed to the United States.

I think it has always been a matter of policy to utilize such available funds, but I think it dignifies the policy to have it explicitly written into the bill.

It is my opinion, and I would not pose as infallible in this area, that countries that are presented in this bill to receive the largest allocations would be the very countries in which the United States would have the greatest amount of available currency either owned by or owed

to it. This is certainly a sound procedure. I would hope that this language in the bill plus this colloquy here on the floor would serve as a reminder to those having to do with the administration of this program to utilize these funds to the extent of every dollar that is feasible.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I may say that I, too, am very glad to see this language. I trust it means counterpart funds. As the House knows these funds can be used only in the country of origin, and we have a good many of them all over the world. The more we can use them for this sort of construction and other expenses the better off we will be, and I think on the whole it will also please the best country.

Mr. AVERY. I might say this would certainly have a most favorable effect on our balance of payments if we can utilize these funds rather than make a further demand upon our gold reserves.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. It certainly would.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5207) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 5207, with Mr. O'NEILL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is essentially the same legislation the House passed last year. The reason it is up again, as I am sure most of you know, is that it went over to the other body, which added a rider having to do with equal rights for women. It was impossible to get agreement for the bill to go to conference, and the legislation died.

I may say that the subcommittee of which I am chairman had little heart for further exercise along this line, but unless we did act there was no possibility of a Foreign Service buildings bill being considered. We did hold several hearings. There are 216 pages of them, actually.

As the gentlewoman from New York said, we have cut the bill where we thought it was justified and in the interest of the country. Actually, the administration asked for a total of $54 million. That included the building and money for maintenance and leasing. We cut it to $49,824,000—or cut it $4,176,000.

I want to commend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] for what he had to say. We have written this language into the bill, that they shall make maximum use of counterpart funds or foreign currencies wherever they can. I think it is worthy to note that in the report on page 4 we have a table which shows that since the inception of this act in 1926, through several administrations, a total of $209,100,000 in foreign currency has been expended over against $32,525,000 in U.S. dollars. So that, actually, we have had something on the order roughly, and this is a rather rough approximation, $6 of counterpart funds for every dollar in U.S. currency. I am not sure that the Department can keep up that ratio because in some of the countries where we need buildings badly and where we have authorized them, there is no foreign currency available. But I believe, in view of the record they have established, we can consider that probably they will do a pretty good job on using foreign currency wherever and whenever they can.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to belabor this and I do not want to take up a lot of time. I think the committee is prepared to try to answer any questions that you may want to ask, but I would like to point out one thing that was a factor and had some bearing on our decisions.

For example, in the hearings you will see that in Cameroon, there is a building which we expect to buy which will cost $75,000 and on which we are now paying $13,796 a year rent. In other words, if we buy that building, it will be paid for in 6 years. In many of these cases, the lease is written so that the money or at least part of the money already paid in rent can apply to the purchase price. While we do sometimes wish that we were not in the position of having to approve some of these things, the committee finds that in the interest of good business it would be better to buy the building when we can write it off in 6 years than it would be to pay rent on it for that length of time.

For example, in Libreville, in Gabon we are going to buy a building for $60,000 or at least the committee approved the authorization and I trust that the Committee on Appropriations will approve it, a building on which we are paying $23,000 a year rent right now. In other words, that building can be written off in less than 3 years.

To pick out another case, in Abidjan on the Ivory Coast we are buying a building that we are now occupying for $95,000 on which we are paying $9,800 a year rent. So that building will be amortized in a little less than 10 years.

I might say to you that the committee studied each of these items carefully. We had the department produce pictures wherever pictures were available and in most cases they were, of the buildings that we are now occupying and intend to buy. We tried to exercise the best judgment that we could.

The subcommittee reported the bill out unanimously, Mr. Chairman. We took it to the full committee and we got a unanimous vote there where the vote was 23 to 0.

I think it is significant to report that present on that occasion there were my friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THOMSON] who is a member of the subcommittee. While both Mr. THOMSON and I had reservations on a couple of items, especially one in Somali, we just could not quite say, "Well, you ought not to build it or you ought to build it." There is so much argument on both sides that the best we could do, we thought, when we agreed to this, was to authorize the item and to tell the department to exercise a great deal of caution in their analysis of the situation in this country before they proceed with the building. I might say we told them to do this in all cases.

As the gentlewoman from New York said in her statement on the rule, we did in Africa, because of the unsettled conditions on that continent, strike out some projects and recommend a good deal of caution in the consummation of other projects.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman spoke of countries in which we have foreign currencies available. Is the gentleman in a position to tell the House the number of countries in which we have foreign currency balances and the total amount involved?

Mr. HAYS. I think the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] has the answer to that and I am glad to yield to the gentleman to answer his inquiry.

Mr. ADAIR. That question was raised in the course of the hearings. The answer given was that there was such a constant change, having in mind demands for currency, that that question has to be answered as of the particular time when building or leasing is to go forward.

There is a constant record kept, but because it is one that constantly fluctuates, we did not think it worth while to put in the report.

Mr. HAYS. What the gentleman is saying is that any figure we might put in as of the date of the hearings would not be an accurate figure as of today.

Mr. MICHEL. I appreciate that. I would make this observation to supplement the comments of the gentleman from Kansas. This is to a very noble end that we utilize these funds for the purpose of generating or offsetting any money under Public Law 480. I was wondering if we could specifically nail down how many countries we find this actually put into practice. If it is one or two countries, we have not done very well. If it is a greater percentage, I would say hats off.

Mr. HAYS. I do not know whether the gentleman was present and heard me read the figures in the record, but up to the present time we have used about $230 million in foreign currency as against about $30 million in U.S. dollars. I think I can speak for both sides of the committee when I say that the subcommittee has a good deal of confidence in the man who is conducting this foreign building program. He was frank with the committee, and we believe he will use every single available cent of foreign currencies he can get his hands on. My guess is that 50 percent of this construction money will be foreign currencies, and perhaps a good deal more.

Mr. MICHEL. I will say to the gentleman I applaud that because these funds have been generated in some of the countries and are laying idle, not to the advantage of the Congress for use when Members are traveling in those countries and when the State Department states it does not want Americans depositing dollars in banks and then traveling in foreign countries. This is one way it could be used to good advantage, and it should be pressed to the fullest extent.

Mr. AVERY. Another thought has occurred to me. I think it might be helpful to have it a part of this debate. It seems to me there could be a situation arise where there might be a matter of priority as to whether these funds might be utilized for this purpose or as a matter of judgment of the Administrator as to where he might prefer to use them in some other category. I would like to have the legislative history in the debate on this measure today reveal—at least the gentleman from Kansas feels—this particular utilization should come in under high priority for the utilization of these currencies rather than to preserve them for a more dubious or less useful purpose.

Mr. HAYS. I think the gentleman's viewpoint is shared by the committee. It is certainly shared by the chairman of the subcommittee.

I may say to the gentleman the department is well aware of the fact that this subcommittee is watching their procedures. As the gentleman will note, this is only for 2 years. We did not make any veiled statement about that. We said it plainly, that what you get in another 2 years will be in great measure dependent on how well you use what you are getting now.

Mr. AVERY. I appreciate the gentleman's observation.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I would like to direct the attention of the Members to the remarks that the gentleman made with reference to the unanimous support the subcommittee and the full committee, gave this bill. You may recall that in the early part of February, when new Republican assignments were made to the committee, there was considerable criticism of the type of men appointed on this side of the aisle. It was charged there would be a battle royal whenever any bill came to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Those of us who now serve have been getting along very well, and we find that the committee is a friendly and cooperative group. The point is that in this case the gentleman from Ohio and his subcommittee convinced all of us that that use of the funds was most practical, and the fact that the committee gave a unanimous report was an indication of the effective job that was done in that respect.

I agree with the gentleman from Ohio that if there is any abuse, it will receive our interested attention in 2 years, and I think the unanimous approach of the committee is extremely revealing.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman. May I say, I never heard anything except very complimentary remarks about the new members on the committee, so I am a little in the dark about it. But, I appreciate his remarks anyway.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to echo what the chairman of the subcommittee has said in many directions. I have sat on that committee for some years with a good deal of distaste and a good deal of unhappiness. This year I assure every one of you that we went into these matters in such detail that even I, who am a Connecticut Yankee, could not find any objection.

There were questions, yes. The gentleman from Wisconsin, Governor THOMSON, had a number; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] had a number; I had several I did not voice because I did not think they were worth it. And, I was determined to do all possible to make this a practical program where we had squeezed out every single bit that we could, that we felt could be lifted out.

I hope very much, Mr. Chairman, that the committee will vote for this very much needed bill. We did not have anything last year, and it is very necessary that we maintain our buildings, that we repair them, that we build additions, and that we erect new buildings in places where we have never had them. That is one of the great problems. I echo what the chairman said, that the men who are doing this work for us are very capable men, something we have not had before. They are top men. They were never reluctant to answer our questions or give us any information that we wanted. Their pictures were as good as could be taken by any Kodak, and we felt very, very inclined to assist in doing the things that they were proving to us were necessary. We have a particular feeling for Mr. Johnstone and Mr. Crockett, who are the two headmen, and we would like to see them continue for a bit so that we can really see the results of this year's planning and operations.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, there are some additional things about this bill that I think ought to be called to the attention of the members of the committee. Adequate mention has been made of the fact that the subcommittee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Ohio worked very diligently. Both the minority and the majority are convinced that we squeezed about all of the excess expenditures out of this measure. Therefore, as has heretofore been said, we are in accord on it.

It might be pointed out further, Mr. Chairman, that although we have tried to draw certain guidelines in this bill, we have at the same time allowed the Department of State a measure of elasticity, within which they can operate. Members will note from page 5 of the committee report that the executive request as to the building or capital account part of the measure and the committee recommendation are broken down into five parts: One part for Africa, one each for the American Republics, Europe, Far East, Near East together with southeast Asia. In other words, within these large geographical areas the Department does have the right to move and to make certain decisions, although the committee has given them very clearly our thinking upon what buildings and what types of buildings ought to be constructed.

I think further, that it would be of interest to the members of the committee to know that last year our total authorization was for $53,899,000.

This year, Mr. Chairman, the request was for $54 million. We have proposed the authorization of $49,824,000, or a reduction of $4,176,000. This is for both the capital account, that is, the construction and the long-term lease side of the program, and for the current or maintenance side.

Mr. Chairman, some Members have expressed to me a concern lest even though we have reduced this proposal to its present figure, that we still perhaps are spending money that we ought not to spend at a time when we are facing a very large deficit. But I would say to those who do have that mental reservation concerning this bill that in the long run, measured over a period of even a relatively few years, the financial benefits to our country will outweigh the short-term expenditures. There is also the fact that in some countries this is the only way we can get needed office and residential accommodations for our American personnel. Therefore, we do believe that this is a necessary and prudent program.

If Members are interested in specific proposals, I would invite their attention to the tables between pages 2 and 3 of the hearings and there they can find listed the buildings, the locations, the types of structures which are proposed.

Mr. Chairman, this measure should pass here speedily and receive the prompt and favorable attention of the other body. I would conclude by saying, as others have said, that we do have confidence in Mr. Crockett and Mr. Johnstone and would hope that they may be continued in their present assignments in the Department because of the quality of the work that they are doing.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN].

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one comment: This legislation was handled, as has been made obvious here, in a strictly nonpartisan manner. Not only that, but the committee examined into each individual project. This was not treated in a gunshot manner. This was not treated in an omnibus manner so that all the Embassies in particular countries would be treated as one. There was examination into each individually proposed Embassy and into each individually proposed building. Therefore, we had a thorough knowledge as a result of examination and cross-examination of the proponents of the various Embassies and buildings and they had to furnish every detail that we sought.

Mr. Chairman, it is on the basis of this close examination that this legislation was submitted. I therefore say that

it is certainly deserving of the concurrence of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, at this time I do want to compliment our chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], for bringing this bill to the floor only after deep scrutiny into all of the projects involved in the bill. I also want to say that it is supported by members of both parties. It reflects the needs of our country to secure better physical accommodations for our personnel and agencies abroad.

This is a reasonable bill. I want to say that I am pleased that I am a member of this committee. As a result of my trips abroad, particularly in Europe, I am better able and qualified to judge those projects proposed in the countries in which I have visited. I had to depend, of course, on those who had traveled in other sections of the world for their firsthand knowledge of our building needs in those areas and countries.

This is another evidence that on-the-spot inspection is most useful to members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and to Members of the House. I earnestly urge and recommend to my colleagues more travel abroad. Such travel pays invaluable dividends in handling a bill of this kind.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to make a few additional observations. H.R. 5207 represents many months of work by the members of the Subcommittee on State Department Organizations and Foreign Operations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. This bill will grant authority to the Department of State to carry out its foreign building program for the next 2 years and to maintain and operate its existing facilities during that period.

The Foreign Service Buildings Act has five principal objectives. They are:

First. To provide consolidated office space for the Foreign Service and other U.S. agencies operating in cooperation with the Foreign Service, except where leasing arrangements are more advantageous.

Second. To secure maximum security at minimum expense through consolidation of facilities.

Third. To provide Government-owned, furnished residences for all Ambassadors and Ministers.

Fourth. To provide Government-owned, furnished residences for officers in charge of consular posts and senior officers of principal missions, including attachés of the Department of Defense and other agencies.

Fifth. To provide Government-owned, furnished quarters for American staff at posts where special housing problems exist, such as health, security, and long-range housing shortages.

In addition to these objectives, the Department of State makes office space available, in its worldwide facilities, to the Department of Defense, USIA, Veterans' Administration, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Federal Bureau of Investigation, General Accounting Office, and for key staff personnel of the Agency for International Development.

A bill similar to H.R. 5207 was passed by both the House and the other body last year. Unfortunately, however, conferees were not appointed.

There are two principal purposes set forth in this bill. The first authorizes $26.3 million for the purchase, construction, major alternation, and long-term leasing of buildings required by the Department of State for its oversea posts. This authorization is $4.1 million below the Executive request. The principal reductions were in the program for Africa due to the unreasonably high costs, the unusually large size of the American complement and unsettled internal conditions in some countries. The other authorizes $23.5 million for the rental, maintenance, repair, and furnishing of existing posts for the next 2 years.

In addition, the bill eliminates the present reference to the Foreign Service Building Commission. This Commission was abolished in 1939 by Reorganization Plan No. II. The bill formally transfers the functions of the Commission to the Secretary of State who has exercised them since 1939.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has recommended the following amounts for the various areas of the world:

Committee recommendation

Area:	*Million*
Africa	$7.14
American Republics	5.36
Europe	6.84
Far East	2.35
Near East and South Asia	2.71
Subtotal	24.40
USIA	1.12
Agriculture and Defense attaché housing	.8
Total	26.32

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe I have had the opportunity to visit a number of the buildings occupied by American personnel, both as offices and as residences. Hence I gave particularly close attention to the Department's plans for that area.

The original Executive request for Europe for the next 2 years was $7,650,000. The committee recommends a sum of $6,839,000—a reduction of $811,000 or more than 10 percent. We specifically deleted proposed projects for Nassau, Bahamas; Hamilton, Bermuda; and Ottawa, Canada—all posts that come within the European area program.

I have always been disturbed by the absence of adequate accommodations for our personnel in Geneva. That city is rapidly becoming an important center of international activity both for government and for private business. Presently we lease space in four office buildings at an annual rental of $100,000. Plans in the 2-year program in this bill will permit the acquisition of a site and the construction of a building for less than $1,400,000. We urgently need a residence for our representative in Geneva. The Committee will be pleased to know that we have had an offer from an American citizen of an old chateau just outside of Geneva. This property has been appraised at $500,000. Efforts are underway to secure additional private money to rehabilitate the residence. If that can be done, the United States will own a most desirable piece of property.

While an outlay of more than $4 million is planned for the rehabilitation of our properties in Paris, the ultimate consolidation of our scattered properties and the sale of some of them such as the present Ambassador's residence will result in the recapture of most of that money. In Lisbon we have been renting an Embassy for more than 30 years; our present annual rent is $10,800. To me it makes sense to buy this property now.

Our annual rentals and quarters allowances for presently occupied buildings in Europe which we can acquire under the authorization contained in this bill amounts to $144,000. To acquire these buildings or construct our own will cost about $1,850,000. Thus in less than 13 years we will have recovered our present annual outlay. This is based on the assumption that rents remain steady. But in Europe, as at home, rents are increasing as the demand for buildings increases. I am convinced therefore that we are making a sound investment for our Nation.

At the present time the United States owns or has under long-term lease overseas, 205 office buildings; 158 residences for Ambassadors and other principal officers; 277 residences for other officers; 269 other residential units; 251 apartment buildings containing 2,366 individual units; and 128 other buildings such as garages and warehouses. The current value of these facilities exceeds $200 million.

It is important to note that the bill directs the use of excess local currencies to the maximum extent possible. Since 1926 local currencies in the amount of $209.1 million have been appropriated for use in the Federal Service buildings program and 32.5 million U.S. dollars have been used. Thus, approximately 87 percent of the funds expended on the program have been in local currenices.

This authorization covers fiscal years 1964 and 1965. About one-half of the funds authorized will be obligated during each year.

In conclusion I wish to bring to the attention of the House the recommendation contained at page 6 of the committee's report concerning the purchase, of furnishings for our oversea posts, in the United States. It is the committee's view that the furnishings should be purchased in the United States, not only to give the benefit of this business to American firms but for the further reason that our oversea posts should serve as showcases of the skills and artistry of American craftsmen and industry.

This program is essential to the efficient operation of our Foreign Service and I urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN].

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, this is what we call a housekeeping bill. In other words, when the U.S. Government has 286 posts throughout the world, including embassies and other governmental buildings, it is obviously essential that, like any good landowner or building owner, attention must be given to

the maintenance and upkeep of these buildings, to the leasing of adequate quarters and to the construction, where necessary, of buildings adequate to house our staffs and to house the offices which are essential to carry on the business of the Government. That is what this bill, H.R. 5207, does.

When the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] spoke, at least by implication, he seemed to be paying a tribute to the subcommittee. I should like to underline what he said and to pay a tribute particularly to the chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. HAYS], for the manner in which these hearings were conducted, for the tolerance which he exhibited, and for the thoroughness with which he and members of the committee went into the proposals that were made by the representatives of the Department of State when they appeared before the committee. It was this cooperative attitude and this constructive method of carrying on the hearings that gained the support of the full committee, including the fairminded members to whom the gentleman from Illinois alluded.

Also I should like to emphasize again the excellent relations that existed between the committee itself and the representatives of the executive branch. These representatives showed themselves to be interested in our recommendations and we were able to discuss matters back and forth in a constructive and friendly manner; suggestions were made by us and they took recommendations in various particulars made by the committee, as they had done in the past.

In this connection, there is one point in the report to which I should like to call attention. It appears on page 6 wherein the statement is made that:

> The committee is concerned that too many of the furnishings of our buildings abroad are of foreign design and manufacture.

The recommendation is made at this point and the further statement is inserted to stress that the Committee expects that there will be increased use of American products in our buildings abroad. The representatives of the executive branch did testify that these recommendations, which have been made by the Committee in the past as well, had been taken to heart and, in fact, in the hearings at page 149 and 150 there is a statement of the various bids that have been requested of American firms to provide furnishings for our embassies abroad. This does not mean that we are taking any jingoistic attitude. It is simply a feeling that for artistic reasons and reasons of propriety as well as stimulation of national industry, first call should be given to American manufacturers in this regard.

So for these reasons, particularly, Mr. Chairman, in consideration of the fact that this bill does represent, as has been said, a reduction of $4,176,000 below the executive request, I am happy to support this bill and I hope that the Committee and the House will do the same.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], a question regarding the language on page 2, subparagraph (F), regarding a limitation on the facilities of the U.S. Information Agency. I suggest to the gentleman that in the budget there are some new broadcasting facilities being requested, and I should like to ask the gentleman whether the word facilities here refers in any way to the construction of new radio facilities throughout the world.

Mr. HAYS. I can say to the gentleman the language may be unfortunate, but it has no reference whatever to radio facilities. It applies only to buildings to house the Information Agency personnel in a list of countries which is available in the hearings. It has nothing to do with radio broadcasting facilities in any way, shape, or form.

Mr. BOW. Did you gentlemen give consideration to the fact that the buildings, for instance, in Liberia, where they have to have some housing for people, and in other places, might refer to radio broadcasting facilities? For instance, there are to be radios in the Philippines.

Mr. HAYS. They said nothing to us about that and we have no requests for buildings for radio facilities.

Mr. BOW. The use of the word facilities here refers to housing and not to the building of radio transmitters and the buildings that have to go along with them?

Mr. HAYS. This refers only to housing or office space or information centers. It has nothing to do with radio broadcasting facilities. It refers only to housing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes to close debate.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank the members of the subcommittee for their attention and their attendance in the hearings on this bill. Both the majority members and the minority members were faithful in their attendance. They asked a lot of good questions. I should like to refer to what the gentlewoman from New York said. There was hardly any time that a situation was alluded to in a specific country that some member of the subcommittee had not an on-the-site inspection and had some on-the-site information. The gentle lady from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] was very helpful in the African end of it, and other members were experienced in other areas where they had had committee business and where they had traveled abroad.

I do want to close by mentioning the fact that I believe the entire subcommittee is grateful to both Secretary Crockett, Assistant Secretary of State for Administration, and Mr. Johnstone, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Foreign Buildings, for their very frank and forthright answers. I trust the fact that there has been public mention of the fact that Members of Congress have confidence in these gentlemen will not hurt them down in the State Department.

I would like to say this, I try to be a friend of the State Department because with some it is popular to use them as a whipping boy. The State Department has no constituency. But I try to be fairminded and friendly to them. But I have really gotten the impression sometimes that if they have any member on their staff who establishes himself as having rapport and the confidence of the Congress, they immediately do something to get rid of him. We did find these two gentlemen to be very forthright and frank and the committee felt they could rely on their judgment.

I say again, I hope that these expressions about these gentlemen by our colleagues will not react unfavorably to them downtown.

I hope we quickly conclude the reading of the bill and under the 5-minute rule if anyone has further questions, we will be glad to try to answer them.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the unanimity with which the committee reported favorably upon this measure and my belief that every possible effort has been made to curtail unnecessary expenditures in this bill, I still must rise in opposition to it. My objections are threefold.

First, although the committee report sets forth the fact that counterpart funds, or foreign currencies, are used primarily for the proposed construction, there is no assurance written into the legislation that such must be done, and, therefore, our presently poor financial condition could be further aggravated by unwarranted expenditures in carrying out the provisions of this bill. If we are to spend additional millions of dollars for construction of governmental facilities, I feel that such should be done here in this Nation so as to help relieve our present unemployment situation, rather than in foreign countries.

As I have been a strong advocate of strict economy in all proposed new expenditures in all Government activities here at home, I should likewise object to the expenditure of millions of dollars in foreign countries. Actually, I consider this more or less another facet of our foreign aid program which I do not believe has produced the desired results.

Second, I object to the passage of this Foreign Service buildings bill because it provides for the construction of new buildings in many emerging nations throughout the world where the government is at best most unstable and the net result could very well be that we would be constructing office buildings for some renegade governmental official such as Castro to confiscate. I believe it the better part of wisdom for us to continue to lease our facilities in these foreign countries until such time as these nations indicate a greater degree of responsibility and permanence.

Also, in this connection, I feel it is extremely difficult, if not impossible—because of the instability of these emerging nations—for us to accurately anticipate the size of diplomatic staff necessary in these various countries. Accordingly, how could we possibly know the requirements for housing and business purposes?

My third objection to this particular measure arises from the report of the

Foreign Affairs Subcommittee in which it appears that primary consideration for the use of these office buildings and living quarters will be given to the State Department, U.S. Information Agency, and Aid for International Development with only secondary consideration given to such important agencies as the Federal Bureau of Investigation, General Accounting Office, the American Battle Monuments Commission, and similar agencies. If such new office buildings and living quarters are to be constructed in the amount of $26,324,000, I believe all of our foreign activities should be given priority according to need rather than special preference given to some particular agencies whose effectiveness I seriously question.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I must register my strong opposition to the passage of this particular measure and urge my colleagues to consider long and hard our financial condition as well as the necessity for the expenditure of these millions of dollars overseas.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4 of the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, as amended (22 U.S.C. 295), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) In addition to amounts authorized before the date of enactment of this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State—

"(1) for acquisition, by purchase or construction (including acquisition of leaseholds) of sites and buildings in foreign countries under this Act, and for major alterations of buildings acquired under this Act, the following sums—

"(A) for use in Africa, not to exceed $7,140,000 of which not to exceed $3,270,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(B) for use in the American Republics, not to exceed $5,360,000, of which not to exceed $4,030,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(C) for use in Europe, not to exceed $6,839,000, of which not to exceed $1,820,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(D) for use in the Far East, not to exceed $2,350,000, of which not to exceed $2,200,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(E) for use in the Near East, not to exceed $2,710,000, of which not to exceed $2,100,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(F) for facilities for the United States Information Agency, not to exceed $1,125,000, of which not to exceed $720,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964, and

"(G) for facilities for agricultural and defense attaché housing, not to exceed $800,000, of which not to exceed $400,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(2) for use to carry out the other purposes of this Act, not to exceed $23,500,000, of which not to exceed $11,500,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964.

Sums appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall remain available until expended. To the maximum extent feasible, expenditures under this Act shall be made out of foreign currencies owned by or owed to the United States."

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do so for the purpose of inquiring of the chairman, under paragraph (G), why is it necessary to single out housing for the agricultural attaché and the defense attachés in the amount of $800,000. How about the other attachés, such as labor, and so forth? Why do we have to single out the agricultural attaché and the defense attaché in this case?

Mr. HAYS. The best answer I can give the gentleman is that it is up to the State Department to provide housing for these people and these are the ones they asked housing for. We did not allow every request, but they did ask for housing for the agricultural attachés and the defense attachés.

Mr. MICHEL. I am glad to hear the gentleman's response to that question for many times in the past the agricultural attaché at these foreign posts has been left out in the cold. I am glad to see that at this particular juncture, they are being recognized for housing at least.

Mr. HAYS. I think I can say to the gentleman that these two categories, these people, come from these particular Government departments whereas your labor attaché, for example, is actually from the State Department and is usually a Foreign Service officer and is taken care of in that category. Whereas, of course, as you know, the defense attaché is from the Department of Defense and the agricultural attaché is from the Department of Agriculture, but it is the responsibility of the State Department to procure housing for them.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 2 of the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926 (22 U.S.C. 293), is repealed.

(b) The first section of such Act (22 U.S.C. 292) is amended—

(1) by striking out ", subject to the direction of the commission hereinafter established,";

(2) by striking out "under such terms and conditions as in the judgment of the commission may best protect the interests of the United States,";

(3) by striking out ", to the extent deemed advisable by the commission,"; and

(4) by striking out ", which buildings shall be appropriately designated by the commission, and the space in which shall be allotted by the Secretary of State under the direction of the commission" and inserting a period and the following: "The space in such buildings shall be allotted by the Secretary of State".

(c) Section 3 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 294) is amended—

(1) by striking out ", subject to the direction of the commission," and "in the judgment of the commission,"; and

(2) by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "and without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (31 U.S.C. 529)".

(d) Section 4 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 295) is amended by striking out ", subject to the direction of the commission,".

(e) Section 9 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 300) is amended—

(1) by striking out "with the concurrence of the Foreign Service Buildings Commission,"; and

(2) by striking out ", as in the judgment of the Commission may best serve the Government's interest".

(f) Section 1(e) of Reorganization Plan Numbered II of May 9, 1939 (53 Stat. 1432), is repealed.

(g) All references to the Foreign Service Buildings Commission, originally established by the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, in all laws of the United States are hereby repealed.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

May I say if anyone is interested, the reason for these last amendments is that all of the functions of this Commission were transferred to the Secretary of State in 1939 and under the reorganization plan. The Commisison has never met since then. I, for one, happen to be a great believer that there are too many laws now, and when we have deadwood we should take it out. We have repealed this, believing it to be in conformity with the facts as they exist.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'NEILL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5207) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 312, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority leader if he can give us some information as to the program for the balance of this week and next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this completes the legislative schedule for the week, and I know of no other business that will be

before the House under our general reservation of programing additional business or conference reports for the balance of the week. We would like to have leave to wait until tomorrow, however, to finish the program for next week.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma, and I will make the request for further information on tomorrow.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENDING TIME WITHIN WHICH CERTAIN FEDERAL-STATE AGREEMENTS ON SOCIAL SECURITY MAY BE MODIFIED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today is similar to one I introduced last year on the same subject. This measure would extend from 1963 to 1966 the time within which certain Federal-State agreements may be modified to give noncovered State and local employees under the divided retirement system procedure an opportunity to elect coverage without undue financial hardship.

As I pointed out at the time I introduced this legislation last year, my State of Rhode Island now has what is known as a "divided retirement system." This means that the State of Rhode Island employees who belong to the State retirement system were enabled for social security purposes to divide, by referendum, the retirement system into two parts: Part a, those desiring coverage; part b, those who indicated by a "no" vote in 1958 their desire not to be covered by social security.

The main obstacle to most State employees in joining the social security system is the prohibitive cost of making payments retroactive to 1956. To correct this problem, it is necessary for the States to have a further period of time in which to negotiate new Federal-State agreements and that the States be given the authority to determine the amounts their employees would pay in order to receive retroactive coverage under the social security system.

This bill is introduced after extensive consultation with the Honorable Raymond H. Hawksley, General Treasurer of Rhode Island, whose help and guidance have been invaluable. Since this measure meets a very real need, it is my hope that it will be favorably considered by the Congress.

THE CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, the President requested that the critics of our Cuban policy recommend constructive proposals rather than criticism of the present situation. I wish to present the following proposals in reply to that request.

Unless a more definite policy is established toward Cuba, we will be confronted with similar situations in other Latin American countries. Cuba has become a center of Communist subversion. Now that the Communists have established a beachhead in the Western Hemisphere, they will use this small island to prepare and train personnel to spread their insidious doctrine throughout Latin America.

For that reason, I believe that the following proposals certainly deserve close consideration if we are ever to arrive at the point of regaining the initiative which slowly slipped away from us after our short-lived blockade:

First. Prohibit all ships that carry cargo to Cuban ports from entering American ports. Also prohibit the owners and countries of such ships from trading with the United States. If they want to trade with Cuba, let them; but, let them know that they will not be able to trade with us.

Second. Establish a Cuban government in exile. This could be done through a special election. This is the democratic process. This would be the most practical solution, rather than to support a half dozen or so splinter groups. We should deal with one recognized government.

Third. Encourage hemisphere governments to prohibit travel to Cuba by Latin Americans for indoctrination and training in subversion and guerrilla warfare.

Fourth. Maximize the Soviet cost of supporting the Cuban regime by a selective boycott of those trading with Cuba.

Fifth. Maintain constant air and on-the-ground surveillance of Cuba.

Sixth. Prevent export or use of arms now in Cuba outside of Cuba.

Seventh. Continue to work toward complete political and economic isolation of Cuba by countries of the Western Hemisphere as well as the rest of the free world.

The free world trade with Cuba has declined from $1.3 billion in 1959 to an estimated $225 million in 1962. This amounts to an 83-percent decline. We should expand this battle through radio, press, books, television, and films, as well as through greatly expanded efforts to make contact with special groups, such as labor, student bodies, and the intellectual and cultural elite.

Eighth. Insist upon removal of all Russian military personnel from Cuba. Certainly 10,000 to 12,000 troops would hardly make a difference to Castro's military force which is now second only to the United States in the Western Hemisphere, unless these Russian troops were to be used to put down an internal uprising or to man missiles which we are told are no longer in Cuba.

To accomplish this end, we must be firm. If all troops are not completely removed, and substantial evidence given to this effect, within a specified period of time, we should reestablish a firm blockade, and be prepared for stronger action if necessary.

We must not let up at all on our effort until we have accomplished the goal of returning Cuba to a free society. However, a free Cuba will not mean a hemisphere free from the threat of communism. Only by successfully overcoming the basic economic and social problems of the region, can we conquer the threat.

LAW DAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the sixth observance of Law Day. In 1961, Congress designated May 1 as Law Day, U.S.A. The theme this year is "Law—Rule of Right not Might."

There are three objectives of Law Day: First, to make more meaningful to Americans their heritage of individual freedom under law; second, to foster increased respect for law and the courts which protect the rights of all citizens; and, third, to emphasize the rule of law in our system, as contrasted with the rule of force and fear under communism.

While we are honoring the rule of law, and the role that it plays in our society, the Communists are parading their military might throughout the Soviet Union and their satellite states. This indeed is one of the essential differences between these systems. We rely on reasoned adjudication to settle our disputes. We jealously guard individual liberties. Their government crushes any dissent by force. Minorities have no rights in the Communist state.

The Constitution is the document which established the institutions of our Government and created the Federal system. This Constitution has been the vehicle for combining an unprecedented amount of freedom of action for individuals and Government with a minimum amount of friction between them. No other nation has achieved this fine balance.

The Supreme Court, at the head of the judicial branch, is the arbiter of our system. This is not an easy task, but I believe that it has done an excellent job of balancing individual and governmental interests. In recent years, the Court has increased the effectiveness of the guarantee of the Bill of Rights and made a living truth of the inscription on the Supreme Court building, "Equal justice under law."

Our courts are a unique instrument for the settlement of disputes. While

Congress legislates broad solutions, often based on partisan politics, the courts permit particularized adjustments, based on reason. This is a very important aspect of our Government. We should cherish it as one of the best assurances that individual freedom will continue to be protected.

Today, however, these foundations of our Nation are under their heaviest attack in recent years from rightwing extremists. Some would limit the jurisdiction of the courts. Others would impeach the Chief Justice. These groups have proposed three constitutional amendments which would radically alter the structure of our Government. The first would permit two-thirds of the State legislatures, acting separately, to submit amendments to the Constitution directly to the States. This would eliminate the national influence of Congress and the National Constitutional Convention, which presently plays an important part in the amendment process. The second would reverse the decision in Baker against Carr and forbid the Federal courts to intervene in the apportioning of State legislatures. The third would create a so-called Court of the Union, composed of the Chief Justices of the 50 State Supreme Courts, which could overrule the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

These amendments would make profound changes in the structure of the judiciary, the relationship between the Federal and State Governments and the stability of the Federal Constitution.

I believe that these amendments would destroy our present Federal Union. They would dissipate our national strength by fragmenting our society. The United States that we have fought so hard to protect from external enemies would perish at the hands of those who subverted it from within.

The dangerous and divisive effect of these attacks on the Court and our Federal system should be countered by those most competent to do it, the members of the bench and bar. Our most prominent legal scholars have recently pointed out that it is the duty of lawyers to promote understanding and voluntary public acceptance of the decisions of the courts. Due to their training and background, lawyers have a special opportunity to explain the fundamental principles of justice on which our society is based and to advance the highest ideals of our society.

On this Law Day, let all lawyers dedicate themselves to this goal. Let us all pledge to take an active role in the fight to preserve and strengthen our legal system. There is no more noble or worthwhile undertaking for our profession.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDING ACT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, for it calls for spending which has no urgency and whose chief benefits would be the increased physical comfort of those in the Foreign Service of the United States.

The United States must borrow money with which to pay its debts. In this situation, it is as immature for the United States to order a glamorous new embassy in Paris as it is for a girl without a bank balance to charge a new hat. Both can wait until there is enough money for a splurge.

I find myself thinking of the projects which do have urgency, which we must have here at home not merely for the comfort but for the livelihood of our heavily taxed people. And I think of the necessary costs for programs which will capture and hold our natural resources for the day when water and forest land are luxuries.

Surely we must establish a chronology for our spending. Somehow, as individuals and as a Government, we must regain the thinking which made it a virtue, not a shame, to say, "We cannot afford that now."

MEETING STREET SCHOOL CHILDREN'S REHABILITATION CENTER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite the attention of the House to the outstanding work being done by the Meeting Street School Children's Rehabilitation Center in my home city of Providence.

Over the years, Rhode Island has made a number of unique contributions to the cause of education for the handicapped child. Rhode Island started the first day school programs for mentally handicapped children in 1896 and established the Emma Pendleton Bradley Hospital for emotionally disturbed children in 1931, to cite just two examples.

In 1946, reacting to the loss of residential treatment for children with cerebral palsy—due to circumstances beyond the control of the previous sponsor—the Rhode Island Society for Crippled Children and Adults started the Meeting Street School for physically handicapped children.

Initially, its activities were limited to helping the child afflicted with cerebral palsy. Today the school is a diagnostic and treatment day center for any child who needs to learn to walk, to talk, to use his hands. It stands ready to help victims of cerebral dysfunction, neuromuscular disorders, learning difficulties, cleft palate, congenital anomaly or amputation, hearing loss, speech defects, quadri- or hemiplegia, aphasia, cerebral palsy, postparalysis, or muscular dystrophy who will benefit from coordinated therapeutic treatment.

In addition, parents and families, caught up in a situation almost as emotionally acute as that besetting their children, are given instructions that will enable them to adjust to the handicapped. For, while medical science continues to bring its utmost force to bear upon these afflictions in an effort to eliminate them in future generations, the problem of caring for today's victims, who need training for useful living, remains with us.

The enthusiasm and ingenuity with which this voluntary organization offers substantial aid to a sizable group of handicapped children marks it as one of the most invigorating forces on the New England medical scene. While shielding the physically handicapped child from the day-to-day competition of the outside world, it helps to prepare him for eventual entry into that world. With no lack of attention to its appointed chores, it has managed a benign infiltration into the community at large that has produced an increasingly enlightened approach to this entire problem.

By its very nature, rehabilitation must lean heavily upon the community in which it is effected. Its usefulness is governed by the avaliability of recourse to professional and other community resources. It invokes numerous disciplines and specialties and its ultimate success depends upon the interrelationship of many factors in our social and economic life for acceptance of its byproduct—and completion of the rehabilitation cycle.

The city of Providence has accepted and responded wholeheartedly to this school whose services remain largely unduplicated in the surrounding area. The city has displayed great empathy for the project, providing material support and integrating the Meeting Street School into its overall plan of services for the disabled. But, most of all, it has demonstrated a true sense of responsibility for absorbing the crippled and disabled into the full life of the community.

Few organizations in the health and welfare field can match the caliber of the Meeting Street School's board of directors. Typical of the citizenship that guides its course are Dr. Eric Denhoff, medical director, and Mrs. John Langdon, executive director.

Mr. Denhoff is president-elect of the American Academy of Cerebral Palsy. He is also a member of the Professional Advisory Committee of the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults and is known throughout the medical world as the author of "Cerebral Palsy and Associated Disorders."

The work of Mrs. Langdon was best described by Dr. John Farrell of the Rhode Island Medical Society a year or so ago when he wrote that "she brought to this project a leadership and enthusiasm that has marked the past decade as one of the brightest chapters in the State's history of voluntary efforts in behalf of crippled children."

Under the dynamic leadership of these two, school functions have been expanded to accommodate ever increasing numbers of handicapped children, even as the effectiveness of services currently offered have been improved. In addition, new services have been developed that reflect a realistic evaluation of community needs.

In 1962 this rehabilitation center helped some 540 children with various physical disabilities in various ways. This year, it anticipates helping more than 600 children—and their parents.

Following the Biblical injunction, the other working members of the Meeting Street School team also "suffer little children to come unto" them. Compelled beyond self-consideration, dedicated to the rescue of handicapped children from the drossheaps of society, they perform their humanitarian tasks in a manner that merits our attention and richly deserves the tributes I offer them here today.

POLITICAL STATUS OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday four Members of the House introduced identical bills to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement in a democratic manner of the political status of Puerto Rico. I have read these bills and I am at a complete loss to understand why they were introduced. They are not in accordance with the treaty between the United States and Spain following the war with Spain. They are not in accordance with all of the acts which Congress has passed for many years affecting Puerto Rico. They are not in accordance with the joint resolution of the Puerto Rican Legislature, which is as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION TO PROPOSE TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA THE PROCEDURE FOR ESTABLISHING THE ULTERIOR FINAL POLITICAL STATUS OF THE PEOPLE OF PUERTO RICO

Whereas the people of Puerto Rico favor the determination of the final political status of Puerto Rico in such manner that no doubt may remain about the noncolonial nature of such status; and

Whereas the people of Puerto Rico consequently favor, in different proportions, three forms of political status for Puerto Rico: Commonwealth status, based on common citizenship and developed to the maximum that may be agreed upon between the Congress of the United States and supporters of such status in Puerto Rico; federated statehood, under conditions equal to those of the federated States that already compose the American Union; independence as this status exists in the Latin Republic of America; and

Whereas those who favor commonwealth status and the supporters of federated statehood are against the separation of Puerto Rico from the United States, and most of the proponents of independence favor that such status be achieved in friendship with the United States; and

Whereas those who support commonwealth status conceive its maximum development, in permanent union with the United States of America, under the following principles:

1. The recognition and reassertion of the sovereignty of the people of Puerto Rico, so that no doubt may remain of their capacity to enter into a compact under conditions of juridical equality;

2. The assurance of the permanence and irrevocability of the union between the United States and Puerto Rico on the basis of common citizenship, common defense, common currency, free market, common loyalty to the values of democracy, and of such other conditions as may be considered, in the compact, of mutual benefit to the United States and Puerto Rico;

3. The specific definition of the powers of the United States with respect to Puerto Rico, which shall exclusively be those essential to the union;

4. All other powers shall be exercised by the constitutional organisms of the people of Puerto Rico;

5. Participation by the people of Puerto Rico in the powers exercised, under the compact, by the Government of the United States, in matters affecting Puerto Rico, in a measure proportional to the scope of such powers. This may include, among other ways of implementing such participation, the right to vote for the President and Vice President of the United States;

6. The adoption of a formula under which the people of Puerto Rico will contribute to defray the general expenses of the U.S. Government, in a manner compatible with the stability and economic growth of Puerto Rico; and

Whereas those who favor federated statehood conceive it as the only desirable form of permanent union with the United States, in the way enjoyed by the 50 States of the Union; and

Whereas those who favor independence conceive it in the form already known in other countries of the Americas; and

Whereas such three forms of political status are and should be based on the sovereign capacity of the people of Puerto Rico, whether it be for joining the Union as a federated State, for becoming independent, or for developing Commonwealth status, in permanent union with the United States, as requested by its supporters and as the Congress may agree, along the lines of the fourth whereas of this resolution:

Whereas it is hereby clearly expressed that nothing in this resolution shall be interpreted as an endorsement by supporters of Commonwealth status of either federated statehood or independence; or as an endorsement by supporters of federated statehood of either Commonwealth status or independence; or as an endorsement by supporters of independence of either Commonwealth status or federated statehood: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico, That—

SECTION 1. To propose to the Congress of the United States the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico, applying the principles here expressed in accordance with the whereases of this resolution.

SEC. 2. The Congress once having expressed the form which it is willing to agree that Commonwealth status may take in consonance with the principles contained in the fourth whereas of this resolution, the three status formulas here specified be submitted to the vote of the people of Puerto Rico, on the basis of such expression by Congress and in accordance with the laws of Puerto Rico, so that the winning formula remain established or be established pursuant to the will of the Puerto Rican people.

SEC. 3. A copy of this resolution, in the English language, be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico in the United States.

SEC. 4. This resolution shall take effect immediately upon its approval and shall continue in effect until its purposes are achieved pursuant to the provisions of section 2 hereof.

Nor are they in accordance with the statements of the White House affecting Puerto Rico as they appeared in the Federal Register on July 25, 1961. That Presidential document follows:

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS—TITLE 3—THE PRESIDENT—MEMORANDUM OF JULY 25, 1961, CONCERNING THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO—MEMORANDUM FOR THE HEADS OF THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 25, 1961.

Because of the importance and significance of Puerto Rico in the relations of the United States with Latin America and other nations, it is essential that the executive departments and agencies be completely aware of the unique position of the Commonwealth, and that policies, actions, reports on legislation and other activities affecting the Commonwealth should be consistent with the structure and basic principles of the Commonwealth.

On July 25, 1952, the Governor of Puerto Rico proclaimed the establishment of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico under its constitution. This proclamation was the culmination of a series of legislative and electoral steps which began with the passage of Public Law 600, 81st Congress, 64 Stat. 319 (1950). Public Law 600 made provision for the organization of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico. In a referendum held on June 4, 1951, the proposals of this law received the overwhelming approval of the people of Puerto Rico.

Following approval, a Puerto Rican constitutional convention drafted a constitution, which was approved by a referendum held on March 3, 1952. The Congress in turn approved this constitution—Public Law 447, 82d Congress, 66 Stat. 327 (1952).

The Commonwealth structure, and its relationship to the United States which is in the nature of a compact, provide for self-government in respect of internal affairs and administration, subject only to the applicable provisions of the Federal Constitution, the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act, and the acts of Congress authorizing and approving the constitution.

On November 27, 1953, the General Assembly of the United Nations recognized that the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, exercising effectively the right of self-determination in a free and democratic way, had achieved a new constitutional status and that, in view of this new status, it was appropriate that the United States should cease the transmission of information with regard to Puerto Rico under Article 73(e) of the Charter, U.N. General Assembly Resolution 748 (VIII) (1953).

All departments, agencies, and officials of the executive branch of the Government should faithfully and carefully observe and respect this arrangement in relation to all matters affecting the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. If any matters arise involving the fundamentals of this arrangement, they should be referred to the Office of the President.

The legislative steps which have led to the achievement by Puerto Rico of Commonwealth status have made inapplicable the

provisions of Executive Order No. 6726 of May 29, 1934, insofar as they pertain to or are connected with the administration of the Government of Puerto Rico. This order no longer applies to Puerto Rico.

This memorandum shall be published in the Federal Register.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

[F.R. Doc. 61-7103: Filed, July 25, 1961; 4:05 p.m.]

TYPHOON DAMAGE TO GUAM AND SAIPAN

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention of our colleagues to a news item concerning Guam and Saipan in the Mariana Islands located in the Western Pacific. These islands have been buffeted by Typhoon Olive during the past 36 hours.

Damages of serious proportions have been inflicted by the storm according to radio dispatches received this morning. Members will recall that last November Typhoon Karen struck Guam. The island was just getting back on its feet when the second typhoon struck yesterday.

The radiograms from Governor Guerrero of Guam and Deputy High Commissioner Benitez are as follows:

APRIL 29, 1963.

RICHARD F. TAITANO,
Director of Territories, Department of Interior, Washington, D.C.:

Assessment of damages of Typhoon Olive indicates it is imperative we request immediately that the President declare Guam a major disaster area. Island buffeted by winds of major intensity, heavy rains over 48 hours. Practically all repairs from Typhoon Karen wiped out. Over 90 percent temporary housing units destroyed. Major problem is restoration of power which now is out islandwide. Majority telephones out. Anticipate breakdown water system as emergency power units break down. Restoration of power could take 2 weeks. Most patients Guam Memorial moved to Navy hospital now operating on emergency generator. Same applies to radio station. Attempting to organize mass feeding plan for literally thousands in schools, churches, other shelters. Initial survey indicates damage to public facilities over $2 million. Figure includes roads, bridges, utilities, staff housing. Local chapter Red Cross asks you notify national headquarters of seriousness of situation. No facilities. Few injuries. But expect some degree of general demoralization of local residents who have been subjected to just too much suffering in recent months.

MANUEL GUERRERO,
Governor of Guam.

APRIL 30, 1963.

Mr. RICHARD TAITANO,
Interior Department of Territories, Washington, D.C.:

Typhoon Olive caused tremendous damage on Saipan. Unable to reach Rota or Tinian. Typhoon passed over both as well as Saipan. It is imperative for us that the President declare a major disaster area in the Marianas. Typhoon eye more than an hour over Saipan. 95 percent of houses badly damaged. Power lines destroyed. Water system inoperative. New hospital roof destroyed. Supply and public works centers badly damaged. All agriculture crops destroyed. No deaths known. Situation very serious. Waiting for your immediate steps. Will supply additional information as known.

JOSE A. BENITEZ.

GORGAS MEMORIAL LABORATORY IN PANAMA

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 27, an extension to the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory in the Republic of Panama was dedicated.

This extension was made possible by an appropriation of the Congress of $500,000.

The Laboratory—a part of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, established by an act of Congress in 1929, was named for Alabama's Gen. William Crawford Gorgas.

It was my privilege to make the principal address at the dedication ceremony. The address follows:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN ARMISTEAD SELDEN, DEDICATION CEREMONIES, APRIL 27, 1963, PANAMA CITY, PANAMA

It is indeed an honor to be here today to take part in the dedication of this important new structure—a structure that symbolizes the common humanitarian goals of the people of Panama and of the United States.

We are dedicating more than a structure, however. This institution represents nothing less than a joint humanitarian venture—one in which Panama and the United States can share great pride.

Although these are troubled times for our hemisphere and for the world—in the humanitarian work that is conducted by this institution—the people of Panama and the United States are as one.

As chairman of the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, I had a part, along with my Alabama colleagues, Senator LISTER HILL and Representative KENNETH ROBERTS, in securing the enactment of legislation to maintain and operate this great research institution. This is especially true of the act of 1960 which authorized the appropriation of $500,000 to build and equip the structure we are now dedicating.

We meet here today not only to dedicate a building, but to pay homage to one whose name is borne by these institutions—the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., and the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory.

Not only do we pay honor to the greatest practical sanitarian of the ages, but also to all those who, through the years, have given so much of their time and talents to the work of the Institute and the Laboratory. In addition, we today recognize and honor all the personnel—scientific and nonscientific, on the isthmus and in Washington—who have effectively and loyally performed their exacting duties in behalf of this institution.

The Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, a nonprofit institution created by an act of the Congress of the United States was incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware on October 25, 1921. The work of the Institute was limited to the United States until the act of May 27, 1928, authored by Congressman Maurice H. Thatcher, formerly a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission and a great friend of Panama, created the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory to be located in the Republic of Panama. The measure also authorized an annual appropriation of $50,000 for its maintenance and operation.

The activities of the Laboratory began January 1, 1929, under the immediate director of Dr. Herbert C. Clark. The Institute restricted its labors to the field of tropical disease as it does today. In connection with the origin of the Institute, it is interesting to note that Dr. Belisario Porras, President of the Republic of Panama, and Joseph E. Lefevre, representing the Panama National Health Board, are both signers of the articles of incorporation. The other incorporators were citizens of the United States. As provided by its bylaws, the Institute has always had an honorary president, the President of the United States.

This valuable site, and its original buildings, were donated to the Institute as the home of the Laboratory by the Panamanian Government.

I shall not attempt in the time allotted to me this morning to give a detailed account of the splendid achievements of the past century in the study and conquest of many of the more deadly diseases, which throughout all the ages have plagued the human race. Ross, Manson, Pasteur, Jenner, Lister, and Reed have been among those who have successfully dealt with our human ills.

However, it remained for William Crawford Gorgas of the Medical Corps of the U.S. Army to plan and execute in Cuba the first campaign to eradicate "Yellow Jack" as a centuries-old plague. By similar methods he also greatly reduced malaria there. This was during the years of U.S. occupation of that island following the Spanish-American War. Then he was sent to Panama, where the great canal was being constructed, and there achieved successful results similar to those he brought about in Cuba. Had the work of Gorgas on the isthmus been unsuccessful, the canal probably would not have been built. Sanitation and the establishment of order were indispensable to the success of the engineering labors that made possible that historic undertaking.

I have mentioned in general terms the great achievements of Gorgas in Cuba and the Isthmus of Panama. As a fellow Alabamian, I feel it would be appropriate on this occasion to remind you of a few of the more interesting details of the life of this great physician.

William Crawford Gorgas was born October 3, 1854, in the environs of Mobile, Ala. He was the eldest son of Josiah Gorgas and Amelia Gayle, daughter of an early Governor of Alabama. Josiah Gorgas, a graduate of the Military Academy at West Point, was of Pennsylvania birth, but he chose Alabama as his home. Young William Crawford Gorgas spent his earlier years in Richmond, Va., where his father was located as chief ordnance officer of the Confederate military forces. His father's Army career greatly influenced the youthful Gorgas to wish for a military career. After the close of the War Between the States, young Gorgas sought an appointment to West Point, but failed to obtain it. His ambition then turned to medicine and a career in the Medical Corps of the U.S. Army. He was a student at the University of the South at Sewanee, Tenn., graduating there in 1876, 66 years before I graduated from the same institution. At the time young Gorgas attended the University of the South, his father was serving as its president.

Gorgas became a student in Bellevue Medical College in New York City in 1876, graduating 3 years later. The years at Bellevue intensified his ambition for a career in the Army Medical Corps. He successfully passed the examination required and became a member of the corps. For the next 10 years he served in the Army Medical Corps chiefly in Texas, North Dakota, and Florida.

During these years, he volunteered and was sent to Fort Brown, near Brownsville, Tex., where for the first time he came to grips with yellow fever—the great enemy he was afterward to know so well and to finally master.

It was at Brownsville he met a Miss Marie Doughty of Cincinnati, Ohio, who was visiting her sister, the wife of the commanding officer of the post. There was an epidemic of yellow fever at the fort, many were dying, and panic was everywhere. Miss Doughty became stricken. Dr. Gorgas ministered to her, and, when her death seemed imminent, he was asked to attend her burial and to read the accustomed service. This he agreed to do, but fate intervened. The young woman began to recover, and recover she did. In turn, the courageous young physician was stricken, but he too survived. Out of these dramatic circumstances a romance sprang, which ripened into marriage. Having experienced yellow fever, both were immune to it. Thus, they were especially fitted to go anywhere it might strike, to live with it, to fight it, and to finally master it. In later years, Mrs. Gorgas remarked: "It would be untrue to say that 'Yellow Jack' was the best man at our wedding; but it would be perfectly true to say that, in a sense, he was an usher."

Then came the Spanish-American War, with Gorgas, a Medical Corps officer with the rank of major, in charge of the yellow fever camp at Siboney in fever-ravaged Cuba. Later in the year 1898, he was back in Havana and was soon made its chief sanitary officer. Gorgas instituted an overall plan for the removal or destruction in the Havana area of every receptacle in the entire region which might be the breeding site of the Stegomyia mosquito and its larvae. Drainage and fumigation practices were maintained. These processes and strict quarantine in a few months destroyed the presence of yellow fever, and the city became one of the healthiest anywhere to be found. To the extent necessary, similar sanitary practices were followed elsewhere on the island, and yellow fever was banished from the whole of Cuba.

Then, in 1904, the United States took up the challenge to build the Panama Canal. Gorgas was appointed chief sanitary officer of the Canal Zone, and assumed his duties as such in the early summer of 1904. He served in this capacity until his appointment in 1907 as a member of the second Isthmian Canal Commission in charge of the health and sanitary work on the isthmus. He accomplished in Panama what he had accomplished in Cuba. The isthmus, which had come to be considered one of the plague spots of the world, became a region of health. Yellow fever was eradicated and malaria greatly reduced. The centers of population on the isthmus became as healthful as cities of the United States.

Thus Gorgas had again proved to the world that the people of the temperate zones could live and thrive in the tropics if proper sanitation were provided.

In the fall of 1913, Colonel Gorgas went to South Africa, on invitation of the Transvaal Chamber of Mines, to investigate and report on the subject of pneumonia then raging among the laborers in the gold and diamond mines in that region. He accepted the call, made the required trip and studies, and submitted recommendations for methods to be employed based on his handling of the same problem among the laborers on the canal project.

The adoption of these recommendations was followed by a gratifying lower death rate from pneumonia in the affected South African areas.

Then, on the invitation of the Government of Rhodesia, in 1914, he visited Salisbury, and suggested methods for handling malaria, which was ravaging that country. While there, he learned by cable that he had just become General Gorgas, through his appointment on January 16, 1914, by President Wilson, as Surgeon General of the U.S. Army with the rank of brigadier general. A year later, by an act of Congress, he became a major general.

As Surgeon General, Gorgas was called on to perform an unprecedented task in arranging the assembly of a mighty army of fit soldiers following our Nation's entry into World War I in April, 1917.

In the summer of 1916 he had served as Chief of the Special Yellow Fever Commission of the Rockefeller Foundation, and had visited various countries in Central and South America which were potential or actual yellow fever centers. He had given advice to local authorities on methods to be employed to eradicate these sources of peril. Everywhere he received the evidences of affection and esteem. The great mission of his life was to aid in the complete extermination of this frightful disease. He found in various places his measures against yellow fever and malaria were being carried out with complete success.

When he retired his post as Surgeon General in 1918 at the age of 65, he promptly accepted the directorship of the yellow fever work of the International Health Board of the Rockefeller Foundation. On May 30, 1920, he sailed for West Africa to make a study of yellow fever conditions there. Then came the stop in London, his illness and death on July 4.

The death of General Gorgas was mourned throughout the British Isles, as well as the United States, Panama, Cuba, and in the world at large. At the command of the British King and by order of the British Government, there was provided for him a funeral service in St. Paul's Cathedral, with the highest military honors. In the historic sanctuary—which is the last resting place of some of the greatest soldiers and sailors known to British history—impressive homage was paid to one who had walked humbly, but had so long successfully labored for his fellow man. He died in the faith in which he had ever lived—that there would be a better tomorrow, and that all should be given the opportunity to live healthy, fruitful lives.

His remains were carried by ship back to his beloved country, and laid in the sacred soil of Arlington National Cemetery in Washington.

General Gorgas was the recipient of an ever-increasing list of accolades and honors, but one of the greatest was the last—bestowed at his bedside in a London hospital by King George the Fifth himself—the insignia of Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George. The King had come to the hospital because, as he said, General Gorgas could not come to the palace to receive the honor.

Today, the fame of this Laboratory bearing his name is known far beyond the boundaries of this hemisphere. Its findings were, in large measure, used for the benefit of the Allied Forces in World War II, especially in the South Pacific areas. Its work is collaborative, not duplicative; its malarial techniques are of the first order.

Panama is an ideal site for the location and operation of a tropical research laboratory. Situated at a center of international traffic and a crossroads of the world—the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory is unrivaled in its opportunity for service to humanity in the field of tropical medicine.

This new building that we today are dedicating is destined to serve its purpose to the benefit of all mankind.

We gratefully acknowledge the splendid aid and cooperation which the Government and the people of Panama have always accorded the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory. This institution has ever been a common denominator of friendship and good will between our two countries.

The conquest of human disease and misery brings our countries and our people together—and so may the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory continue to symbolize that which unites, rather than separates, good neighbors of the Western Hemisphere.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROBERT S. McNAMARA

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting an extremely important and very well reasoned commentary by Joseph Alsop which appeared in the Washington Post this morning.

This column should be read by everyone who is sincerely interested in the defense of the United States.

It should be read by everyone who wishes to preserve and maintain the traditional American principle of civilian control over the military.

It should be read by everyone who appreciates the sacrificial services of a dedicated American like Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and who applauds his determination to bring about effective and meaningful unification in our armed services.

It should be read by everyone who recognizes the need for our Nation's getting the maximum value from the defense dollar.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 1, 1963]

THE ATTACK ON MCNAMARA

(By Joseph Alsop)

This week, Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN'S special investigating committee will resume its hearings on the TFX contract. The word is going round the Capital that the Senator, a determined man, means to keep the hearings going until July, and expects to "turn the TFX contract around."

That means, in effect, that Senator MCCLELLAN hopes to force the resignation of Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. For the Secretary can hardly accept the reversal of his decision, to award this contract to General Dynamics instead of the Boeing Co., without resigning because his judgement has been reversed.

The TFX controversy turns upon technicalities which outsiders, conspicuously including Senate investigating committees, are by no means well qualified to weigh. Secretary McNamara, who had to fight hard to get even one brief hearing from the committee, has had no real chance to tell his side of the story.

But the rights and wrongs of the TFX affair are very much less important, in any case, than the rights and wrongs of the attack on McNamara, for which the TFX affair is merely the vehicle. If this vehicle had not served, another one would have been made to serve. That was inevitable, in view of the nature of McNamara's effort.

Since the Defense Department was established, all the successive Secretaries before McNamara have been divisible into two categories. The good Secretaries were primarily interested in national defense. To these, the contemporary members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff invariably behaved with extraordinary arrogance.

The bad Secretaries were primarily interested in budgetary economies. To these, the Joint Chiefs invariably behaved with shameless servility. When the pie was big, in short, the uniformed Chiefs of the armed services complained because there was not more pie; and when the pie was limited, they bowed to the ground to get the largest slice.

This curious rhythm was only once interrupted. In the early summer of 1948, after the Czechoslovak coup d'etat, the Joint Chiefs confronted James V. Forrestal with combined requests for a defense budget of $24 billion. Forrestal, although intensely defense minded, rather than budget minded, knew he could not get so large a sum in those days. Hence he asked the Chiefs' help in making cuts.

Knowing Forrestal was defense minded, the Chiefs refused to help. Forrestal then worked almost from dawn until late at night, day after day, week after week, through all that summer and autumn, making his own line-by-line cuts to reduce the defense budget to $18 billion. The strain of that unaided effort was what, in fact, killed James Forrestal.

Despite that warning, McNamara has set out to accomplish more than Forrestal ever attempted. He is just as defense minded as Forrestal was, and his first requirement is a fully adequate national defense program, but he has also been trying to reduce the unit cost of national defense, which has risen continually and remorselessly, and not least under the economizing Defense Secretaries like Charles E. Wilson and Louis Johnson.

To obtain maximum defense at minimum cost, in turn, McNamara has had to use his own judgment, just as Forrestal was driven to do in that summer of desperate overwork which caused his breakdown and death. For a Secretary of Defense who wishes to do what McNamara is trying to do, there is no alternative to relying on his own judgment.

This is the case because the Army, Navy, and Air Force have never been able to agree among themselves, not just on their own roles and missions, but also and far more importantly, on the basic strategy and tactics of our national defense. With three wholly different defense concepts, the Chiefs of Staff invariably ask for appropriations to defend the country in three different ways at once.

In these circumstances, if there is to be a unified strategic and tactical defense concept, it has to be imposed on the Chiefs of Staff by the Defense Secretary. In the existing system no one else can insist upon a unified concept. Yet if a unified concept is not insisted upon, one of two results must follow.

Either the cumulative bill for satisfying three conflicting concepts will be completely astronomical or the bill will be reduced to meet budgetary limitations and the defense program will be inadequate. In the last 16 years the Joint Chiefs have repeatedly shown that they prefer the risks of an inadequate defense program to the strain of agreement on a unified defense concept.

McNamara has been trying to change all this, by improving a unified concept. In other words, he has been trying to get the United States the best weapons that money can buy, but no more weapons than are really needed, and at the lowest manageable unit cost. That is the source of his troubles with the Joint Chiefs, which are the sources, in turn, of the TFX affair.

POPULATION FACTORS IN THE ECONOMY

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a subject of crucial importance to economic growth is population increase and change, including change in the age-sex mix of the total population. In my opinion, this subject has great relevance to our current economic situation and should be studied in more detail.

Although little work has been done in this field by the economics profession, I was pleased to note a study prepared recently by Fiduciary Counsel, Inc., a private investment advisory firm. Conclusions reached by this study support my own belief that population factors do carry considerable weight in influencing general economic conditions.

At the present time, the 15 to 29 age group is exploding, while the 30 to 44 group is declining. Since the 30 to 44 ages comprise the "biggest spending and most productive age group," its failure to grow has had an important impact upon economic growth. In the latter part of the sixties and the early 1970's, however, this trend will be reversed, with a resulting increase in the demand for residential construction and durable consumer goods. Furthermore, the nonproductive age groups—19 and under and 65 and over—are increasing at a more rapid rate than the population as a whole. It is projected that this segment will account for more than half of the total population in the latter part of the decade, placing the need for maximum productivity upon the working men and women.

Mr. Speaker, this subject of population factors is of crucial importance for determination of future government policies and I ask unanimous consent that these excerpts from "Population Factors in the Economy" be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

EXCERPTS FROM "POPULATION FACTORS IN THE ECONOMY," PREPARED FOR FIDUCIARY COUNSEL, INC., BY JOHN H. MANLEY, 1963

There are three major movements in the character and location of the U.S. population importantly influencing general economic conditions and specific investment decisions: (1) Great variations in the rates of growth in different sections of the country; (2) a continuation of the very long term trend toward concentration of the population in relatively few huge urban areas, which appears to be accelerating; (3) an age distribution oddity resulting from an abnormally low birth rate in the 1930's and an abnormally high rate in the late 1940's and 1950's * * *.

The approximate 15-to-29 age group is certainly exploding but there is a middle group from 30 to 44 which is declining and there is also evidence of a resumption of a long-term decline in the birth rate, which probably was only interrupted in the war and postwar years. * * *

This surge in the population in the high teens and in the twenties has several other significant investment and general economic implications. Particularly in the lower portions of this age group, these young people are not large buyers of new cars. However, as every parent knows, they do represent a very heavy pressure of demand for second-hand cars, firming prices in that market and thereby reducing the effective cost of a new car to the older and more affluent segments of the population. Similarly, these young people are not significant buyers of single family homes. The high teens and low twenties, however, is where the bulk of new family formations are to be found, with a resulting requirement for new living space of some sort, mostly apartments. The present very high rate of activity in apartment building as a percentage of all residential building is explainable largely by this fact. In the latter part of the 1960's and the early 1970's this wave passing through the population will create a heavy demand for individual home construction unless, because of high land prices and high construction costs, there is a tendency toward increased general preference for multiunit residential building. Such a development, to a degree, is probable. * * *

Probably the biggest spending and the most productive age group is that from 30 to 44. This segment of the population is expected to decline by some 2 million people during the current decade. This, of course, represents the trough reflecting the low birth rate in the thirties and early forties. The failure of this age group to exert any positive demographic force in the sixties is a very important economic fact which is opposed to the earlier designation of the decade as the "soaring 60's."

The very high percentage increases in the population in the late teens and the twenties now going on and to continue through the decade creates problems of finding employment for these young people. It is also expected to mitigate the upward pressure on wages by increases in the work force which should tend to weaken the effectiveness of the labor unions. There are a number of other elements entering into this very complex situation, including the rapidly increasing trend toward automation in most industries, the change in the educational requirements for members of the labor force, the tendency toward an increased number of women in the work force and the like * * *.

In the aggregate, this nonproductive group (19 and under and 65 and over) is increasing at a more rapid rate than the population as a whole. In the latter part of this decade it will account for half of the total population compared to only 42 percent in 1950. This certainly points to a need for maximum productivity for the working portion of the population which must support a nearly equal number in the nonworking age groups. It probably also points to some increase in the normal working life, although the social security system and the recent reduction in the permissible retirement ages for both men and women is a powerful incentive in the opposite direction.

LEGISLATIVE OPERATIONS ROUNDTABLE, A FORWARD STEP BY CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may

extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the American people have had more than one opportunity in the past few months to be proud of the work of the U.S. Civil Service Commission in protecting the merit basis of the civil service system, and improving the effectiveness of Government employees. I want to call specific attention to a new program, cosponsored by the Office of Career Development, U.S. Civil Service Commission, and the American Political Science Association, called Legislative Operations Roundtable for Executives, running the week of May 13 to 17, 1963.

The purpose of the roundtable is to "enhance the Federal career executive's knowledge and understanding of executive-legislative relations through an examination in depth of congressional functions and processes, and the relationships between these and executive branch operations." Participating in the roundtable will be 30 Federal civilian and military executives who are at the GS–15 level, or its equivalent, and above.

Each day will feature two or more lectures by outstanding political scientists and governmental leaders. Preparatory readings from the best works on the subject of Congress and the legislative process are assigned before each lecture, with supplemental reference reading suggested as well. Following each session, a roundtable discussion will take place to exchange ideas and impressions and gain added perspectives. The lecturers and subjects are as follows:

LEGISLATIVE OPERATIONS FOR EXECUTIVES

PROGRAM SCHEDULE

Monday, May 13, 1963:

From 9:45 to 12: "Congress and the American System," Dr. Charles S. Hyneman, professor of government, University of Indiana.

From 1 to 3:15 p.m.: "The Organization of Congress," Dr. Nelson W. Polsby, assistant professor of government, Wesleyan University.

Tuesday, May 14, 1963:

From 9 to 11 a.m.: "The Legislative Process," Dr. Ralph K. Huitt, professor of political science, University of Wisconsin.

From 1 to 2:45 p.m.: "External Pressures on Congress," Mr. James W. Foristel, legislative representative, the American Medical Association.

From 3 to 4:45.: "Social and Geographical Influences on Congressional Composition," Mr. Richard M. Scannon, Director, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce.

Wednesday, May 15, 1963:

From 9 to 11 a.m.: "Representing and Informing the People," Hon. MORRIS K. UDALL, Representative from Arizona, U.S. House of Representatives.

From 1 to 4 p.m.: "Work Behind the Scenes—The Congressional Staff," Mr. Stephen Horn, legislative assistant to Senator THOMAS R. KUCHEL, Mr. Leo H. Irwin, Chief Counsel, Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives.

Thursday, May 16, 1963:

From 9 to 10:30 a.m.: "The Executive Side of the Coin," Mr. Bradley H. Patterson, Jr., National Security Affairs Adviser, Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Department of the Treasury.

From 10:45 to 12: "Liaison Between the Executive Branch and Congress," Mr. Kenneth M. Birkhead, Assistant to the Secretary (Legislative Liaison), Department of Agriculture.

From 2:15 to 4:30 p.m.: "Financial Policy Determination and the Appropriations Process," Mr. Robert A. Wallace, Assistant to the Secretary, Department of the Treasury.

Friday, May 17, 1963:

From 9:30 to 10:30 a.m.: "Representing and Informing the People," Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE, Senator from New Jersey, U.S. Senate.

From 10:45 to 12:30 p.m.: "Congress and the Courts," Dr. Carl B. Swisher, professor of political science, the Johns Hopkins University.

From 2:30 to 4:30 p.m.: "Legislative-Executive Branch Relations," Dr. Richard E. Neustadt, professor of government, Columbia University.

Mr. Speaker, as can be seen by the above list of subjects, and the number of sessions, this project has been well conceived and thoughtfully produced. The Civil Service Commission has recognized the need to make executive branch employees more responsive to the total legislative process. Certainly the increased knowledge on the part of these public servants will decrease any suspicion or lack of understanding between the two branches of Government.

There is an additional significance in this joint effort between the Office of Career Development and the American Political Science Association. It indicates the opportunities available for cooperation between public agencies and private organizations in improving the democratic process, and enlightening those participating in it. Special credit should go to Mr. James R. Beck, Jr., Director, Management Institutes, Office of Career Development, U.S. Civil Service Commission, and Mr. Donald G. Tacheron, assistant director, American Political Science Association, for their imagination and foresight in producing this program.

LAW DAY, U.S.A.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, throughout the Nation we are observing today Law Day, U.S.A. One of the extensive observances being conducted is in Wichita, Kans., where the Wichita Junior Chamber of Commerce has erected a replica of the Berlin wall in the downtown area. The Wichita Bar Association is actively in the forefront of Law Day activities.

It is highly appropriate that we observe a day set aside as Law Day because our Nation's very society and structure rest upon the philosophy of the rule of law. Significantly, the United States observes its Law Day at the same time that Communist nations, led by the Soviet Union, use May Day to demonstrate their disregard for law and freedom.

There is no more appropriate occasion than May Day—May 1, 1963—for us to recall the basic moral and philosophical principles upon which our free society is based and contrast these principles with the cynical, immoral, and atheistic philosophy that underlies international communism.

Above the entrance to the U.S. Supreme Court Building is engraved the inscription: "Equal justice under law." This is a fitting motto, not only for the Court, but for all Americans. For it is the law which has made this a great and strong Nation. We must remember that ours is a government of laws—not men. We must never take our liberty for granted and we must remain ever alert. Each of us should consider himself a watchdog of all the basic human rights which are part of our American heritage.

REDS STRUT ON MAY DAY

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, today is the traditional holiday of the worldwide Communist conspiracy. From Peiping to Moscow to Cuba the Reds strut and bluster, showing off their military strength and reemphasizing the final Communist objective—the destruction of freedom and worldwide domination of the Communist conspiracy.

The show of military might, the bragging and the threats are not new. This is a traditional demonstration from the top of the wall of the Kremlin. What makes this May Day different is the worldwide show being put on in Moscow where Khrushchev is staging a special production featuring his little bearded Cuban puppet and using the occasion to thumb his nose at the United States and give Castro an opportunity to tell how he has humiliated and brought to terms the mightiest nation in the world, the leader of the free world.

Khrushchev and Castro have been given this propaganda initiative because of the failure of the Kennedy administration to rid Cuba of Russian Communist aggression. The Red dictator can sneer at the leadership of the United States because President Kennedy has not pursued a policy of strength and firm determination to win the cold war against communism. Spurred on by the Kremlin apologists who evidently are shaping our foreign policy, the President has relied on pleading with Khrushchev to honor treaties, by attempting to make deals such as pulling our missile bases out of Greece and Turkey and protecting Castro against his own people who are fighting to regain their freedom.

The Kennedy concessions to Khrushchev have not brought peace in the world. They have resulted, instead, in a renewal of war in Laos. While the President sends an envoy with hat in

hand to Moscow to beg agreement, American Armed Forces are committed to an undeclared war brought on by the Communists in South Vietnam and 80 American boys have died there.

From the top of the Kremlin today Khrushchev and Castro can tell the crowds that Cuba is still a Communist stronghold in the Western Hemisphere containing Russian arms, missiles and thousands of Russian troops. They can say they have defied the United States to drive them out. And they are right because the President through fear, or lack of understanding of the Communist conspiracy, or because of his belief in his own superior wisdom and ability will not face up to communism in Cuba.

On this May Day the failure of the President to deal with the Communist conspiracy is shown in all its stark reality.

Mr. Speaker, this day should bring forth new resolution on the part of the United States to take the offensive against communism. We should resolve now to get the Communists out of Cuba, every last Russian soldier and weapon and we should see for ourselves that they are out, not take the word of an international liar and gangster who lacks morality and who firmly believes in the rightness of breaking his agreements. We should reimpose at once, the Monroe Doctrine.

If President Kennedy is unwilling or unable to assume the leadership expected of him as President and Commander In Chief of our Armed Forces, then it may be time for the Congress and the people to force the issue in order to protect the sovereignty of the United States and the security of our people. We dare not allow another May Day to record additional failures of the Kennedy administration. Another year may be too late.

The larger tragedy seems to be that, if forced to take action, the President may still not understand why—expedient actions when not in a clearly understandable framework of recognizable principles, are extremely dangerous, at best. What we really need is a firmly announced, clearly understood foreign policy that reestablishes the Monroe Doctrine and U.S. sovereignty. This posture the world would understand and would respect and honor. This posture, I am now convinced, President Kennedy can neither understand nor assume.

COMMUNIST FILMS IN FAIRFAX COUNTY

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, public attention has been strongly drawn in recent days to several films obtained for public showing by the Fairfax County Public Library. The local American Legion organization has vigorously opposed use of these films because the authors or producers were believed to be Communists or Communist sympathizers.

The films entitled "Picture in Your Mind" and "Japan" were produced by Julien Bryan.

The film "The Brotherhood of Man" was coproduced by Gene Weltfish.

Mr Speaker, I would like to insert at this point the factual records of these two persons as furnished me from the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

GENE WELTFISH

Gene Weltfish, president of the Congress of American Women (A–1948: C–1949: I–1956), New York, spoke at a meeting of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (A–1948: C–1942: I–1956), according to Daily People's World, November 10, 1947, page 2. The Daily Worker, March 4, 1948, page 2, reported that Gene Weltfish was among the signers of a committee * * * statement attacking deportation of Communists. The same publication, August 10, 1950, page 5, listed her among signers of the committee's statement against denaturalization. She was named as a sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born in the following sources: an undated letterhead received in July 1950: a 1950 letterhead, an undated letterhead with a speech given by Abner Green at a conference held December 2–3, 1950; a book of coupons issued by the organization, undated; a letterhead of the Midwest Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, April 30, 1951; and the Daily Worker, April 4, 1951, page 8. The Daily Worker, August 24, 1951, page 8, reported that Prof. Gene Weltfish, sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, was among those who signed an open letter to the President, protesting the jailing of Abner Green, secretary of the organization.

The Daily Worker, March 15, 1951, page 8, reported that Dr. Gene Weltfish was a sponsor of the American Peace Crusade (C–1951: I–1956: S–1958). She was shown to have been a sponsor of the American People's Congress and Exposition for Peace (I–1956) held under the auspices of the American Peace Crusade in Chicago June 29–July 1, 1951, by the Call to the Congress and a leaflet entitled "American People's Congress * * * invites you to participate in a National Peace Competition" June 29, 1951. The Daily Worker, May 1, 1951, page 11, reported that Dr. Weltfish was a sponsor of a contest of songs, essays and paintings advancing the theme of world peace, under the auspices of the American Peace Crusade.

Dr. Gene Weltfish spoke at a mass rally to protest lynchings, held in New York August 28, 1946, under the auspices of the Civil Rights Congress (A–1947: C–1947: I–1956: S–1957), as shown on a handbill entitled "Lynch Terror Stalks America." The Daily Worker, February 28, 1947, page 2, reported that Gene Weltfish signed a statement issued by the congress in defense of Gerhart Eisler. A program for a conference of the Civil Rights Congress of New York, October 11, 1947, indicated that Gene Weltfish participated in a panel at that meeting. She was shown to be a sponsor of the group's National Civil Rights Legislative Conference, January 18–19, 1949, in a leaflet, "Let Freedom Ring" containing the conference program. A Civil Rights Congress letterhead dated May 7, 1948, showed that Gene Weltfish was among the signers of an open letter to Congress urging defeat of the Mundt anti-Communist bill, circulated by the congress. The Daily Worker, August 3, 1948, page 2 reported that Dr. Weltfish signed a congress statement protesting the arrest and indictment of Communist Party leaders. The same publication on January 25, 1949, page 10, reported that she was a member of an organization delegation to the Freedom Crusade in Washington, D.C., which urged dismissal of indictments against the Communist leaders. An advertisement in the Evening Star, October 30, 1951, page A–7, "paid for by contributions of signers," listed Gene Weltfish among the signers of an open letter to the Attorney General of the United States on behalf of the four jailed trustees of the bail fund of the Civil Rights Congress. The Daily Worker, November 12, 1951, in an article on page 6 and an advertisement on page 8, named Dr. Weltfish among those scheduled to speak that evening at a memorial and protest meeting in New York City urging support of a petition to the U.N. entitled "We Charge Genocide," circulated by the Civil Rights Congress under whose auspices the meeting was to be held. She was listed among those who were to speak at the sixth anniversary dinner of the Civil Rights Congress, March 26, 1952, in the Daily Worker of that same date, page 3.

Gene Weltfish was president of Woman Power, published monthly by the Congress of American Women (A–1948: C–1949: I–1956), as shown in testimony of Walter Steele before this committee on July 21, 1947 (p. 35 of his testimony). Dr. Weltfish was president of the Congress of American Women as shown by an organization letterhead dated February 25, 1949, and the Bulletin of the Congress of American Women, July 28, 1946, page 2. A leaflet entitled "What Is the Congress of American Women?" named Dr. Weltfish as vice chairman of the Continuing Committee of the Congress of American Women (undated). Soviet Woman, July-August 1946, page 4, reprinted a report by Gene Weltfish to the Executive Committee of the Congress of American Women on the International Democratic Women's Federation which met in Paris in June 1946. According to the Daily Worker, February 11, 1948, page 10, Dr. Weltfish was a member of the Executive Committee of the Women's International Democratic Federation (C–1949: I–1956), with which the Congress of American Women was affiliated.

According to the program for the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace (C–1949) held in New York March 25–27, 1949, under the auspices of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions (C–1949: I–1956), Gene Weltfish was one of the sponsors. An edited conference report entitled "Speaking for Peace," pages 72 and 143, reported that Dr. Weltfish spoke at the conference on the subject, "Fascism, Colonialism, and World Peace." She was a sponsor of the conference of the national council * * * October 9–10, 1948, as shown in a leaflet entitled "To Safeguard These Rights * * *" published by the council's bureau of academic freedom.

Dr. Gene Weltfish, anthropologist and author, was among members of the Continental Committee for U.S. Participation in the American Continental Congress (C–1951) in Mexico City, September 5–10, 1949, according to the Call to the Congress and the Daily Worker, July 29, 1949, page 5. A leaflet entitled "World Congress for Peace—Paris," (I–1956) April 20–23, 1949, listed Dr. Gene Weltfish as a member of the American sponsoring committee for the Congress.

A press release of the American Council for a Democratic Greece (A–1948) dated March 17, 1948, contained the name of Dr. Weltfish in a list of members of the organization's board of directors.

The program for a testimonial dinner given by the American Slav Congress (A–1948: C–1949) in New York October 12, 1947, listed Dr. Gene Weltfish among the sponsors for that affair. The Slavic-American, official publication of the American Slav Congress, in its fall 1948 issue, page 18, reported that Dr. Gene Weltfish, professor of Columbia

University, spoke briefly at the closing session of the 4th American Slav Congress in September 1948, in Chicago.

The Daily Worker, April 6, 1952, page 8, magazine section, reported that Dr. Gene Weltfish was the speaker at a conference to safeguard the welfare of our children and our homes, held March 22, 1952, in New York City under the auspices of the American Women for Peace (C–1951).

Dr. Gene Weltfish was named as one of the sponsors of American Youth for Democracy (A–1947: C–1944: I–1956) in the program for a dinner marking the organization's first anniversary, October 16, 1944.

The call for a conference on China and the Far East, October 18–20, 1946, was issued on an undated letterhead of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy (A–1949: I–1956: J–1952) which was setting up the conference in conjunction with the National Committee To Win the Peace (A–1947: I–1956). Dr. Gene Weltfish was named among sponsors of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy on this letterhead as well as on others dated January 9 and July 11, 1947 and May 28, 1948. Gene Weltfish was among those said to have signed an open letter to the President of the United States, released by the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy October 7, 1946, and contained in the pamphlet, "What Price Philippine Independence?" by George Phillips (p. 32).

The Daily Worker, September 20, 1947, page 8, and the Worker, September 28, 1947, page 10, named Dr. Gene Weltfish as a speaker for the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade (A–1947: C–1944: S–1955). The Daily Worker, January 15, 1948, page 5, named Gene Weltfish as having participated in a picket line against Franco, which was sponsored by Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.

Dr. Gene Weltfish was one of the signers of a petition to the President of the United States "to bar military aid to or alliance with Fascist Spain" which was circulated by the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee (A–1947: C–1944: I–1956) as shown by a copy of the petition attached to an organization letterhead dated May 18, 1951.

Letterheads of "Soviet Russia Today" (C–1944: J–1952) dated September 8 and 30, 1947, and an undated letterhead received in April 1948, contained the name of Gene Weltfish in a list of members of that publication's advisory council.

Dr. Gene Weltfish, identified as an anthropologist, was named as having sent greetings to women of the Soviet Union on the occasion of International Women's Day, along with other members of the Committee of Women of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship (A–1947: C–1944: I–1956: S–1956). The program for the "Congress on American-Soviet Relations," December 3–5, 1949, named Gene Weltfish as an endorser of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

A pamphlet, "For a New Africa," named Gene Weltfish as having participated in a conference on Africa in New York City April 14, 1944, held under the auspices of the Council on African Affairs (A–1947: I–1956). A booklet, "Seeing Is Believing—Here Is the Truth," published in 1947 by the Council on African Affairs, listed on the back cover the names of council members including that of Dr. Gene Weltfish. The Daily Worker, April 26, 1947, page 12, reported that Gene Weltfish was among the signers of a statement issued by the council. The same publication in its issue of March 29, 1948, page 7, named Dr. Weltfish as a member of the council's executive board.

Gene Weltfish was a signer of the brief submitted by Cultural Workers to the U.S. Supreme Court during the October 1949 term, in behalf of John Howard Lawson and Dalton Trumbo. The following reference to John Howard Lawson, Dalton Trumbo, and others, appeared in a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, December 31, 1948, page 9: "Each of these witnesses refused to affirm or deny membership in the Communist Party. * * * In each case the committee presented voluminous evidence to show affiliations with Communist organizations and a copy of the witness' Communist Party registration card." Lawson and Trumbo were convicted of contempt of Congress and sentenced to 1 year in jail and fines of $1,000 each (Washington Times Herald, May 30, 1950, p. 1). They began serving their sentences June 11, 1950 (New York Times, June 11, 1950, p. 3).

The Daily Worker, February 16, 1949, page 2, and February 20, 1949, page 10, named Gene Weltfish as one of those protesting the procedure in the trials of Communist leaders. The same publication, November 30, 1948, page 11, reported that Gene Weltfish signed a telegram in behalf of Robert Thompson, a Communist; on December 15, 1948, page 1, the Daily Worker showed her to be a member of a delegation on behalf of Mr. Thompson. She was one of the sponsors of the National Nonpartisan Committee To Defend the Rights of the 12 Communist Leaders, as shown on the reverse side of an organization letterhead dated September 9, 1949. Robert Thompson was one of 11 Communist leaders who were convicted October 14, 1949, of conspiracy to teach and advocate the violent overthrow of the U.S. Government (New York Times, Oct. 15, 1949, p. 5).

The Daily Worker, June 11, 1947, page 5, reported that Gene Weltfish was among the sponsors of a banquet in celebration of the 85th birthday anniversary of Mother Ella Reeve Bloor.

An undated leaflet, "Prominent Americans Call for * * *" (received in September 1950) named Prof. Gene Weltfish as having endorsed the World Peace Appeal (C–1951).

Letterheads of the Voice of Freedom Committee (A–1953) dated June 16, 1947, and May 12, 1948, listed the name of Dr. Gene Weltfish among sponsors of the organization.

A brief item on Gene Weltfish was included in "Biographical Notes on Convention Personalities," released by the Progressive Party (C–1956: I–1956) just prior to its convention in Philadelphia in July 1948.

The 20th Anniversary Almanac of the Metropolitan Music School (C–1957) published by the Citizens Committee for the Metropolitan Music School, on page 6 listed Dr. Gene Weltfish as an honorary chairman of the committee.

Dr. Gene Weltfish was shown to have been one of the original sponsors of the National Committee To Secure Justice for the Rosenbergs (C–1955: I–1956) in an article in the Daily Worker, January 3, 1952, page 3, in which announcement of formation of the organization was made. Dr. Weltfish was shown as an organization sponsor in the following sources: numerous letterheads during the period from January 1952 through June 1953: pamphlets entitled "Let's Not Have a Dreyfus Case in America," back cover; "The Rosenberg Case: A Fact Sheet," back cover; and "To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case," by William A. Reuben, page 32 (all distributed in 1952 by the National Committee To Secure Justice for the Rosenbergs). The Daily Worker, October 15, 1952, pages 3 and 6, reported that Dr. Gene Weltfish was among those urging that the death sentence against Julius and Ethel Rosenberg be set aside. The same publication, January 21, 1953, page 7, listed Dr. Weltfish among artists and writers seeking clemency for the Rosenbergs.

Dr. Weltfish testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in September and October 1952, in hearings on the subversive influence in the educational process, at which time she took the fifth amendment when questioned as to Communist affiliations. Subsequently she appeared before the Senate Subcommittee on Investigations, Committee on Government Operations in March and April 1953, again taking the fifth amendment. During her testimony before the latter committee she revealed that her tenure as a professor at Columbia University would cease at the end of the semester. The Daily Worker, April 2, 1953, page 5, in an editorial attack on her dismissal from the Columbia faculty, blamed the discharge on her adherence to "the principles of academic freedom." On page 6 of the same issue, she was reported as having taken the fifth amendment because she did not "want to enter into an arena of political manipulation." Daily People's World, April 8, 1953, page 7, reported Dr. Weltfish's dismissal from the Columbia faculty as having resulted from her use of the fifth amendment.

JULIEN BRYAN

"Soviet Russia Today," May 5, 1936, page 5, contains photographs by Julien Bryan. This publication was cited as "a mouthpiece of the Communist Party" in the June 25, 1942, report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (p. 21) as a Communist front in the committee's report on March 29, 1944.

The Daily Worker of May 6, 1937, page 5, lists Julien Bryan as a lecturer for New Masses, which Attorney General Biddle cited as a "Communist periodical" and the Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited as a "Communist front * * *" on a number of occasions. It is one of the official organs of the Communist Party.

Several sources list Julien Bryan as a guide or tour conductor to the Soviet Union and as having lectured on the Soviet Union. (See Daily Worker, May 1, 1937, p. 6, and April 5, 1937, p. 7; and New Masses, March 16, 1937, p. 29.)

Julien Bryan's name also appears as a leader of a seminar in the Intourist Bulletin, March 1, 1939, page 3. Intourist Bulletin was a publication of Intourist, Inc., the Soviet State Tourist Co.

Volume 1 of the Public Hearings of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities contains a reprint of a great deal of evidence submitted by Mr. Walter Steele in connection with his testimony before the committee on August 17, 1938. This material contains the following reference to a speech on Russia made by Julien Bryan:

"The United Farmers' League is a section of the International Peasant Council of Moscow. It was organized in the United States in 1926. It is active in farm strikes. Alfred Taile, secretary of the league, has an extensive jail record for his agitational activities and leadership of mass resistance of farmers in the Middle West. Its organ is the United Farmer. The league was merged with the Farmers' National Committee for Action at a national convention held in Chicago in 1933.

"'A Call to Action' was issued to farmers asking them to 'unite their fight.' Russian farmers were described in glittering terms by Julien Bryan in a lecture on Russia. Clarence Hathaway, of the New York bureau of the Communist Party, addressed this 'united front' congress. Fifty-nine farmers' organizations were reported represented, but the Communists edged in the Communist Party, the (Communist) Labor Sports Union, the Young Communist League, the Young Pioneers, the United Farmers' League, the Communist Unemployed Councils, the Share-

Croppers Union, and scores of State committees of action, quickly organized by them in order that they might assure the Reds control."

In addition to the above references to Julien Bryan, the following on Julien Bryan are found:

Photographs by Julien Bryan appeared in the Daily Worker on April 14, 1936, page 5 and March 31, 1936, page 5.

In volume 1 of the Public Hearings of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, a reference to Julien Bryan appears in the evidence submitted by Mr. Steele, in connection with his testimony on August 17, 1938. The following paragraphs appear:

On June 4, 1936, the Washington Times editorially criticized the production of "Communist approved films" by the March of Time. The pictures were said to have been photographed in Russia by Julien Bryan, a professional lecturer on Soviet Russia, and a member of the national committee of the communistic Friends of the Soviet Union in 1933.

Bryan gave an illustrated lecture at Washington Irving High School in New York, May 15, 1936, under the auspices of Soviet Russia Today, the organ of the Friends of the Soviet Union, a communistic movement headed by Corliss Lamont, son of the partner of Morgan, the Wall Street banker (public hearings, p. 541).

TESTIMONY OF WALTER S. STEELE, 1947

The International Film Foundation, Inc., 1600 Broadway, New York, N.Y., is promoting film plays on Russia. It propagandizes among American youth. Julien Bryan is executive director (exhibit 51).

Mr. Speaker, I have presented this material as a service to the American Legion and all citizens who have taken an interest in this public controversy in order that they might have full information to guide their future actions.

I am compelled to add that the long record of Communist activities on the part of these film producers makes it impossible for me to believe other than the films were made as Communist propaganda vehicles.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HEALEY, for Wednesday, May 1, 1963, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. LINDSAY (at the request of Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin), for 45 minutes, on May 8.

Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 15 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin) and to include extraneous matter:)

MRS. FRANCES P. BOLTON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CORMAN.

Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. TOLL.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 30, 1963, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2833. An act to amend subdivision d of section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96d) so as to give the court authority on its own motion to reexamine attorney fees paid or to be paid in a bankruptcy proceeding;

H.R. 2849. An act to amend section 47 of the Bankruptcy Act; and

H.R. 4549. An act to amend section 4103 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the appointment of the Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 2, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

757. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the seventh report of the Office of Civil Defense, Department of Defense, on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment for the quarter ending March 31, 1963, pursuant to subsection 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

758. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on payment of insufficient rental by Curtiss-Wright Corp., Wright Aeronautical Division, Wood-Ridge, N.J., for commercial use of Government-owned facilities furnished by the Department of the Air Force, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67), and the authority of the Comptroller General to examine contractors' records, as set forth in 10 U.S.C. 2313(b); to the Committee on Government Operations.

759. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled, "A bill for the relief of Chief M. Sgt. Samuel W. Smith, U.S. Air Force"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 5985. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 5986. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the rate of duty on brooms made of broom corn; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5987. A bill to terminate the retailers excise tax on cosmetics and other toilet preparations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5988. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the manufacturers excise tax on all-channel television sets shall be 5 percent instead of 10 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 5989. A bill to amend section 872 of the act of March 3, 1901, relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 5990. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Charitable Solicitation Act to require certain findings before the issuance of a solicitation permit thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 5991. A bill to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 5992. A bill to provide time off with pay for certain Government employees engaged in certain grievance settlements and labor-management business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 5993. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a mid-decade census of population, unemployment, and housing in 1965 and every 10 years thereafter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 5994. A bill to license and regulate private employment agencies in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 5995. A bill to provide for appointment of temporary employees to career positions in postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 5996. A bill to increase the participation by counties in revenues from the National Wildlife Refuge System by amending the act of June 15, 1935, relating to such participation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 5997. A bill to amend the Area Redevelopment Act to clarify the areas which may be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 5998. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to extend the time within which certain Federal-State agreements may be modified to give noncovered State and local employees under the divided retirement system procedure an additional opportunity to elect coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 5999. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Academy of Foreign Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 6000. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the method of computing retired pay of certain enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 6001. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the Waukegan Port District, Illinois, of certain real property of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.J. Res. 393. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim October 9 in each year as Leif Erikson Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H. Res. 329. Resolution amending clause 2 (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the Congress to delete from the 1964 defense appropriation bill the provision allotting an arbitrary percentage of repair and conversion work on the vessels of the U.S. Navy to private shipyards, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.R. 6002. A bill to provide for the free entry of one set of musical handbells for use of Emmanuel Lutheran Church, Rockford, Ill.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 6003. A bill for the relief of Remi L. Pizarro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 6004. A bill for the relief of Jose Honorio Picos-Millan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H.R. 6005. A bill for the relief of Christos Deligiannis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 6006. A bill for the relief of Harold McDonald Maloney and his wife, Yvonne Angela Maloney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 6007. A bill to permit the vessel *SC–1473* to engage in the fisheries; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.R. 6008. A bill for the relief of the widow and minor children of the Reverend Donald Aksel Olsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Res. 330. Resolution honoring the late Rossell G. O'Brien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

100. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Americans for Constitutional Justice, Inc., San Diego, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a redress of grievance relating to alleged violations of the civil rights of Adolphus Hohensee and Donald K. Smith who have been convicted of conspiracy to commit fraud, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 1, 1963

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rabbi Solomon B. Freehof, Rodef Shalom Temple, Pittsburgh, Pa., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, amid Thy chosen servants in Senate assembled, we rise in reverence of Thee. For this blessed land which we ever serve, for the bounties with which Thou hast dowered it, for its unfading love of liberty, and for its privilege of being the fortress of human freedom, we thank Thee and shall ever praise Thy name.

Grateful are we that this, our beloved Republic, is not alone in its world mission; that there are those, near and far, who stand by our side. On this 15th anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel, we thank Thee especially that among our allies is the small and precious Republic built in the Holy Land where Thou didst first reveal Thyself unto us all. The origins of this new state are much like ours. From the beginning it has held up a torch of welcome for the homeless, and with courage and wisdom it is building a land of promise.

O bless that new Republic. May it ever be as ours has been, a land of freedom and of hope. May Thy benediction rest upon us all, that in Thy light our path may grow clear as we walk toward the fulfillment of Thy purposes for the children of men. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 30, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 5888) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 5888) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following committees and subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Production and Stabilization Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports, will be stated.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show that I oppose confirmation of the following nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service:

First. The nomination of Chester Bowles.

Second. The nomination of E. Allan Lightner, Jr.

Third. The nomination of Henry A. Byroade.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc. The question is on the confirmation of the nominations.

The nominations were confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONAL UTILITY INSTALLATIONS AT MARSHALL SPACE FLIGHT CENTER, HUNTSVILLE, ALA.

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction of additional utility installations at the Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

COST ASCERTAINMENT REPORT, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a cost ascertainment report of that Department, for the fiscal year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 59

"Whereas there is a provision in the 1964 defense appropriation bill which authorizes the allotment of 35 percent of the repair and conversion work on vessels of the U.S. Navy to private shipyards; and

"Whereas the best interests of national defense would be served if the workload and the skilled labor force at the Pearl Harbor Shipyard is kept at its present level; and

"Whereas diversion of work from the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard as a result of the application of said provision would result in a subsequent reduction in force at the shipyard; and

"Whereas the reduction in force at the shipyard would have a serious effect on the import income of the State of Hawaii; and

"Whereas the employees laid off would be forced to seek employment elsewhere in the State of Hawaii where unemployment is already high; and

"Whereas some skilled workers may find it necessary to migrate elsewhere or seek other types of employment, thus removing or allowing to deteriorate, skills which have been developed at the expenditure of much time, energy and money by both the skilled workers and their employer, the U.S. Navy: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, General Session of 1963, the Senate concurring,* That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby respectfully requested to delete from the 1964 defense appropriation bill the provision authorizing the allotment of 35 percent of the repair and conversion work on vessels of the U.S. Navy to private shipyards; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be sent to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators from the State of Hawaii, the Honorable DANIEL K. INOUYE and the Honorable HIRAM L. FONG, and to the Representatives from the State of Hawaii, the Honorable THOMAS P. GILL and the Honorable SPARK M. MATSUNAGA.

"ELMER F. CRAVALHO,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"SHIGETO KANEMOTO,
"Clerk, House of Representatives.
"NELSON K. DOI,
"President of the Senate.
"SEICHI HIRAI,
"Clerk of the Senate."

PRICES OF CATTLE AND HOGS—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF KANSAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, there is great concern in the livestock industry over the recent drop in prices of cattle and hogs.

The recent session of the Kansas Legislature approved House Concurrent Resolution 41, in which they urged and requested Congress, the U.S. Tariff Commission, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to do everything in their respective powers to bring about a reduction and stricter control of the importation of beef and other red meats from any foreign countries.

Many of our cattle feeders have suffered severe losses during the past few months and it is my hope that action will be taken that will protect the markets for these producers.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 41

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the U.S. Tariff Commission to reduce and control the importation of beef and other red meats from foreign countries and to establish smaller quotas and other controls on such imports, and to investigate the buying and selling of beef and other red meats by large retail outlets, including chainstores operating within the continental limits of the United States and to take such action thereon as may be indicated

Whereas in the past 2 months, the price of beef has dropped approximately 25 percent; and

Whereas this drop in price can be attributed largely to controlled buying and selling by large retail outlets in the United States; and

Whereas the expanding imports of beef and other red meats on the hoof and in the frozen or processed form, including canned and pressed meats, pose a very serious threat to the domestic cattle and livestock industries of this country; and

Whereas such imports into this country of beef and other red meats are currently expanding at a rate which is altogether out of proportion to any justifiable need and at the present time such imports constitute a high percent of our domestic consumption of beef and other red meats; and

Whereas the domestic livestock producers of this country have for some time been expending their own funds to expand the national market for beef and other red meats and if imports of these commodities are not further restricted any expansion in said national market will result only in providing foreign competitors with a most attractive market at the expense of the American producers; and

Whereas the feeding of grain to cattle and livestock by the domestic cattle and livestock industries provides the principal means of solving the burdensome feed-grain surplus now depressing the total agricultural market; and

Whereas a reasonable restriction on imports of beef and other red meats would provide a means of reducing this feed-grain surplus, as Americans would then consume American fed beef and livestock rather than that fed in foreign countries; and

Whereas the further prosperity and strength of this country is in a large measure dependent upon a prosperous and growing domestic agricultural economy: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, the Senate concurring therein: That we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States, U.S. Tariff Commission, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to do everything within their respective powers to bring about a reduction and stricter control of the importation of beef and other red meats in any form from any foreign country and to establish smaller quotas for the importation of the same, such quotas to be predetermined on an annual basis, thus providing American beef and livestock producers with the needed protection and vital encouragement necessary for the maintenance and welfare of their own industry, and helping insure the future prosperity and strength of this country. It is further urged that an investigation be made of the buying and selling of beef and other red meats by large retail outlets, including chainstores operating within the United States; and that appropriate action be taken to restrain any practices which are deemed inimical to the welfare of the citizens of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the President and Vice President, and the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, to each Member of the Kansas delegation in the Congress of the United States, and to the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission.

CHARLES ARTHUR,
Speaker of the House.
L. D. HAZEN,
Chief Clerk of the House.
Adopted by the Senate April 10, 1963.
HAROLD H. CHASE,
President of the Senate.
RALPH E. ZARKER,
Secretary of the Senate.

TRADE PROGRAM WITH COMMON MARKET COUNTRIES—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF KANSAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, U.S. exports of over $1 billion worth of agricultural commodities to the European Economic Community countries are most important to the agricultural economy of our Nation.

Every effort must be made to keep these markets open and expand them in every way possible.

Under the proposed trade program with the Common Market countries. agriculture is in a most difficult situation. Our negotiators must ever keep in mind the importance of this market and not trade agriculture down the river.

The Kansas Legislature approved House Concurrent Resolution 35 with regard to the importance of this agricultural market.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 35

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress and the President of the United States to take all necessary and appropriate action to secure continued access for U.S. agricultural exports to the countries comprising the European Economic Community

Whereas for many years the exports of U.S. agricultural commodities to the European Economic Community countries have been substantial, amounting in the calendar year 1961 to a total of $1,191 million, or 23 percent of the total U.S. agricultural exports to all destinations, and 31 percent of all U.S. agricultural exports sold for dollars; and

Whereas such trade has been satisfactory and beneficial to both the United States and the countries comprising the European Economic Community; and

Whereas the United States has advocated and practiced for a number of years a policy of expanding international trade and pursuant to that policy has supported the establishment of the European Economic Community; and

Whereas since its establishment the European Economic Community has adopted a policy with respect to agricultural imports which is highly protectionist and based upon the imposition of arbitrary and unreasonable restrictions on the importation of competitive agricultural commodities; and

Whereas the continuation of such a policy will seriously interfere with the previously existing satisfactory and beneficial trade relations between the United States and the European Economic Community and the loss of such trade will adversely affect the economy of both areas; and

Whereas the economy of the State of Kansas as an important producer of wheat and feed grains as well as other agricultural commodities will be seriously impaired if the present restrictive program of the European Economic Community is continued; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States enacted during the past year legislation submitted by the President giving him broad powers in the field of world trade expansion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representative of the State of Kansas, the Senate concurring therein, That the Congress and the President of the United States and the representatives of Kansas in the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby respectfully urged to take all necessary action to see that the channels for agricultural exports from the United States to the European Economic Community countries are kept open and that in the administration of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 no concessions be made to the European Economic Community or the countries comprising such Community on agricultural or industrial exports to the United States without satisfactory reciprocal concessions giving fair and reasonable access to U.S. agricultural commodities; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress; to the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate; the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House; the chairman of the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture; to U.S. Senator FRANK CARLSON, U.S. Senator JAMES B. PEARSON, and Representatives ROBERT J. DOLE, WILLIAM H. AVERY, ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, JOE SKUBITZ, and GARNER E. SHRIVER.

CHARLES ARTHUR,
Speaker of the House.
L. D. HAZEN,
Chief Clerk of the House.
Adopted by the senate April 10, 1963.
HAROLD H. CASE,
President of the Senate.
RALPH E. ZARKER,
Secretary of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment:

S. 762. A bill to provide for increased wheat acreage allotments in the Tulelake area of California (Rept. No. 166).

REPORT ENTITLED "ANTITRUST MONOPOLY ACTIVITIES, 1962"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 165)

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary I ask unanimous consent to submit a report entitled "antitrust and monopoly activities, 1962" pursuant to Senate Resolution 258, 87th Congress, 2d session, as extended, together with individual views.

I ask that the report, together with the combined individual views of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 1428. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain easements in IWW, Lake Charles Deep Water Channel; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Louisiana when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 1429. A bill to amend the authorization to appropriate money for the maintenance and operation of three experimental stations of the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BURDICK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

S. 1430. A bill for the relief of James Jouravloff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 1431. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act in order to exclude from the definition of interstate commerce for the purposes of such act commerce directly between any point in a State and any point on the Outer Continental Shelf and commerce between points in the same States through such Continental Shelf; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 1432. A bill to prescribe a national policy with respect to the acquisition, disposition, and use of proprietary rights in inventions made, and in scientific and technical information obtained, through the expenditure of public funds, and for other purposes; and

S. 1433. A bill to amend the Sherman Act to prevent restraint of trade and monopolization arising from the use of proprietary rights in inventions made through the expenditure of public funds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. COTTON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. PELL):

S. 1434. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DODD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 1435. A bill for the relief of Evelyn F. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 1436. A bill to prescribe with greater particularity the conditions under which proprietary interests of the United States in inventions may be waived pursuant to section 305 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 1437. A bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. MCCARTHY):

S.J. Res. 76. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim October 9 in each year as Leif Erikson Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN EASEMENTS IN INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LAKE CHARLES DEEP WATER CHANNEL

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, some time ago, in the interest of navigation, it was necessary for the U.S. Engineers to relocate a portion of the Intracoastal Waterway in southwest Louisiana. This relocation caused a portion

of the canal south of Sulphur, La., to become obsolete. Since this portion of the canal no longer serves any purpose in the interest of navigation and can be effectively utilized by the Calcasieu Parish police jury, I am introducing a bill, in behalf of myself and my colleague the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], to transfer the responsibility for maintenance and upkeep of this obsolete channel to Calcasieu Parish. Since this portion of the canal was authorized by Congress for navigation, this legislation is necessary in order to change the authorization and eliminate the portion of the canal that no longer serves navigation. It is my understanding that this transfer of responsibility is in the best interest of all concerned and will receive a favorable report from the agencies concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1428) to provide for the disposal of certain easements in Intracoastal Waterway, Lake Charles Deep Water Channel, introduced by Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR MAINTENANCE OF THREE EXPERIMENTAL STATIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which has been submitted and recommended by the Department of the Interior pertaining to the appropriations for the maintenance and operation of the Bureau of Mines Experiment Stations in three areas including Grand Forks, N. Dak., in my own State. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Assistant Secretary of the Interior, John A. Carver, which accompanied this proposed legislation, be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1429) to amend the authorization to appropriate money for the maintenance and operation of three experimental stations of the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BURDICK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter presented by Mr. BURDICK is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 23, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "to amend the authorization to appropriate money for the maintenance and operation of three experimental stations of the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes."

It is suggested that the proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

Section 1 of the bill eliminates the limitation on the authorization for appropriations for the maintenance and operation of the Bureau of Mines experiment stations at Reno, Nev. (rare and precious metals); Grand Forks, N. Dak. (lignite research); and Schuylkill Haven, Pa. (anthracite); and authorizes the appropriation of such sums as are necessary for the purpose. The limitations were included in three acts passed during the period between 1942 and 1950.

The limitations upon the authorization for appropriations which are contained in these acts presuppose a situation in which specific appropriations are made for the individual stations. However, the appropriation process does not follow that pattern. Requests for funds for the Bureau of Mines are not phrased in terms of specific programs to be carried out at individual research stations, nor are appropriations made on that basis.

Appropriations requests for "Conservation and development of mineral resources, Bureau of Mines," are submitted in terms of 5 major activities, which are divided into a total of 15 subactivities. The items in such a request are justified and explained in terms of the programs which they are designed to carry out, without respect to the geographical locations or the particular stations at which various phases of the work may be done. This procedure enables the Congress to consider on an integrated basis the program proposed by the Bureau of Mines in each major area of work for the ensuing fiscal year, in the field of conservation and development.

A lump sum appropriation is made by the Congress for "Conservation and development of mineral resources." After appropriations have been made by the Congress, the Bureau adjusts its programs to conform to the action and instructions of the Congress and allocates funds among its stations in such a manner as most effectively to accomplish the programs for which funds have been made available. As a result, experimental or research stations of the Bureau may undertake assigned work in one or more of the major activities for which funds have been appropriated.

Thus, in fiscal year 1963, each of the three stations mentioned in the proposed bill received an allocation of funds from a lump sum appropriation "For expenses necessary for promoting the conservation, exploration, development, production, and utilization of mineral resources, including fuels, in the United States, its territories and possessions; and developing synthetics and substitutes; $26,675,000."

We believe that the limitations on the appropriation authorizations mentioned above should be repealed because, as a practical matter, they are inconsistent with the current appropriation process. There are no similar limitations applicable to the other 17 experimental and research stations of the Bureau of Mines and we believe that there is no need for such limitations. The enactment of the proposed legislation will put all such stations in the same status in this regard.

Section 2 of the proposed bill would eliminate an annual reporting requirement of the Lignite Research Laboratory no longer required of any other facility of the Bureau of Mines. The report on this single part of the Bureau's program has been specially prepared each year for the Congress. It contains the same information which is included in other reports published by the Bureau of Mines, including its annual report.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this draft bill from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. CARVER, JR.,
Acting Secretary of the Interior.

NORTHEASTERN WATER AND RELATED LAND RESOURCES COMPACT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill sponsored by me and Senators RIBICOFF, PASTORE, COTTON, SALTONSTALL, and PELL providing for a Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact.

I cosponsored legislation on this subject during the 87th Congress and a similar measure passed the House during the last session. Hearings were held on the House-passed version, H.R. 30, by a special subcommittee of which I was chairman and a report of the hearing was printed. Because of the pressure of other business this legislation was not considered by the Senate during the closing days of the last session.

The compact, calling for the integration and consideration of the whole of New England as one viable, interdependent and geographical unit, is absolutely essential if the wastage, poor planning and mistakes of the past are to be avoided.

Mr. President, we in New England have precious few natural resources left and if we do not properly conserve and preserve what remains we will leave a lean heritage indeed to our children and our children's children.

The compact would develop an agency with cooperative membership from the six States and interested Federal agencies, which could recommend, survey, and encourage overall planning with a view to properly developing our remaining natural resources in New England.

Without the compact, New England may well fail to maintain its leadership in agriculture, industry, and in recreation. With the compact, New England can plan to properly develop its resources in an intelligent and efficient manner in this highly industrialized and fast-moving era in which we live.

Four New England States—Connecticut, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island—have already ratified the compact and agreed to participate in it and now it is necessary to secure Federal approval by the enactment of this legislation.

The opposition to the compact has been largely expressed in regard to procedural matters, and, with notable exceptions, not in opposition to the philosophy or the ultimate aims of the compact.

For example, interested Federal agencies have raised questions regarding voting procedures under the compact. I am sure that questions of this type can be resolved without disturbing the language of the compact as ratified by the four New England States and can be made a part, if necessary, of the enabling provisions of the bill.

I am hopeful that this year we can get early committee action in the Senate and get this legislation, which has so much long-term significance for my area of the country, on the floor of the Senate where it can be voted upon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1434) granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact, introduced by Mr. DODD (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent and approval of Congress is given to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact, as hereinafter set out. Such compact reads as follows:

"NORTHEASTERN WATER AND RELATED LAND RESOURCES COMPACT

"Article I

"Findings

"The northeastern part of the United States is by virtue of geographic location and other characteristics a great natural resource area which, with more intense use of natural resources, increasingly requires coordinated planning as a basic ingredient of effective resource management and orderly growth of the region. The work of the New England-New York Inter-Agency Committee demonstrated that a continuation and furtherance of activities such as those undertaken by it would be of great value. To this end, it is the intent of this compact to establish and provide for the operation of a joint agency for the Northeast.

"Article II

"Purpose

"It is the purpose of this compact to provide, in the northeastern region, improved facilities and procedures for the coordination of the policies, programs, and activities of the United States, the several states, and private persons or entities, in the field of water and related land resources, and to study, investigate, and plan the development and use of the same and conservation of such water and related land resources; to provide means by which conflicts may be resolved; and to provide procedures for coordination of the interests of all public and private agencies, persons and entities in the field of water and related land resources; and to provide an organization for cooperation in such coordination on both the federal and state levels of government.

"Article III

"Creation of Commission

"There is hereby created the Northeastern Resources Commission, hereinafter called the Commission.

"Article IV

"Membership

"The Commission shall consist of one member from each party state to be appointed and to serve, in accordance with and subject to the laws of the State which he represents, and seven members representing departments or agencies of the United States having principal responsibilities for water and related land resources development to be appointed and to serve in such manner as may be provided by the laws of the United States.

"Article V

"Functions

"It shall be the responsibility of the Commission to recommend to the states and the United States, or any intergovernmental agency, changes in law or policy which would promote coordination, or resolution of problems, in the field of water and related land resources. The efforts of the Commission in coordination of work and resolution of conflicts may be directed towards all state and federal activities involved in water and related land resources development responsibilities and shall include the coordination of the following:

"(1) Collection and interpretation of basic data.

"(2) Investigation and planning of water and related land resources projects.

"(3) Programing (including scheduling) of water and related land resources construction and development.

"(4) Encouraging of the referral of plans or proposals for resources projects to the Commission.

"The Commission shall use qualified public and private agencies to make investigations and conduct research in the field of water and related land resources, but if it is unable to secure the undertaking of such investigations or original research by a qualified public or private agency, it shall have the power to make it own investigations and conduct its own research. The Commission may make contracts with any public or private agencies or private persons or entities for the undertaking of such investigations, or original research within its purview.

"Article VI

"Voting

"No action of the Commission respecting the internal management thereof shall be binding unless taken at a meeting at which a majority of the members are present and vote in favor thereof: provided that any action not binding for such a reason may be ratified within thirty days by the concurrence in writing of a majority of the Commission membership. No action of the Commission respecting a matter other than its internal management shall be binding unless taken at a meeting at which a majority of the state members and a majority of the members representing the United States are present and a majority of said state membership together with a majority of said members representing the United States vote in favor thereof: provided that any action not binding for such a reason may be ratified within thirty days by the concurrence in writing of a majority of the state members and the concurrence in writing of a majority of the members representing the United States.

"Article VII

"Finances

"A. The Commission shall submit to the Governor or designated officer of each party state a request for funds to cover estimated expenditures for such period as may be required by the laws of that jurisdiction for presentation to the legislature thereof. Any such request shall indicate the sum or sums which the Commission has requested or intends to request be appropriated by the United States for the use or support of the Commission during the period covered thereby.

"B. With due regard for such monies and other assistance as may be made available to it, the Commission shall be provided with such funds by each of the several states participating therein to provide the means of establishing and maintaining facilities, a staff of personnel, and such activities as may be necessary to fulfill the powers and duties imposed upon and entrusted to the Commission.

"With due allowance for monies otherwise available, each budget of the Commission shall be the responsibility of the party states, to be apportioned among them on a weighted formula based 50% on population and 50% on gross land area, such population and gross land area to be determined in accordance with the last official U.S. Census of Population, but provided that the last contributions of all of the states shall not be required to exceed $50,000 annually and provided further that regardless of the number of states party to the compact at any time the maximum annual contribution required of any state shall not exceed its share of the $50,000 as determined above. Any state may contribute such funds in excess of its share, as determined above, as it may desire.

"C. The Commission shall not pledge the credit of any jurisdiction. The Commission may meet any of its obligations in whole or in part with funds available to it under Article VIII (E) of this compact, provided that the Commission takes specific action setting aside such funds prior to the incurring of any obligation to be met in whole or in part in such manner.

"D. The members of the Commission shall be paid by the Commission their actual expenses incurred and incident to the performance of their duties, subject to the approval of the Commission.

"E. The Commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements. The receipts and disbursements of the Commission shall be subject to the audit and accounting procedures established under its by-laws. However, all receipts and disbursement of funds handled by the Commission shall be audited by a qualified public accountant and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the Commission.

"F. The accounts of the Commission shall be open at any reasonable time for inspection by such agency, representative, or representatives of the jurisdictions which appropriate funds to the Commission.

"Article VIII

"Administration and Management

"A. The Commission may sue and be sued and shall have a seal.

"B. The Commission shall elect annually, from among its members, a chairman, vice-chairman and treasurer. The Commission shall appoint an executive director who shall also act as secretary, and together with the treasurer, shall be bonded in such amounts as the Commission may require.

"C. The Commission shall appoint and remove or discharge such personnel as may be necessary for the performance of its functions irrespective of any civil service laws which might otherwise apply. The Commission shall establish and maintain, independently, by contract or agreement with the United States or an agency thereof, or in conjunction with any one or more of the party states, suitable retirement programs for its employees. Employees of the Commission shall be eligible for social security coverage in respect to old age and survivors insurance provided that the Commission takes such steps as may be necessary pursuant to federal law to participate in such program of insurance as a governmental agency or unit. The Commission may establish and maintain or participate in such additional programs of employee benefits as may be appropriate to afford employees of the Commission terms and conditions of employment similar to those enjoyed by employees of the party states generally.

"D. The Commission may borrow, accept or contract for the services of personnel from any state of the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, from any

intergovernmental agency, or from any institution, person, firm or corporation.

"E. The Commission may accept for any of its purposes and functions under this compact any and all appropriations, donations, and grants of money, equipment, supplies, materials and services, conditional or otherwise, from any state or the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, or intergovernmental agency, or any institution, person, firm or corporation, and may receive, utilize and dispose of the same.

"F. The Commission may establish and maintain such facilities as may be necessary for the transacting of its business. The Commission may accept, hold, and convey real and personal property and any interest therein.

"G. The Commission may adopt, amend, and rescind by-laws, rules, and regulations for the conduct of its business.

"H. The Commission shall make and transmit annually, to the legislature and Governor of each party state, and to the President and Congress of the United States, a report covering the activities of the Commission for the preceding year, and embodying such recommendations as may have been adopted by the Commission. The Commission may issue such additional reports as it may deem desirable.

"Article IX

"Other Compacts and Activities

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to impair, or otherwise affect, the jurisdiction of any interstate agency in which any party state participates nor to abridge, impair, or otherwise affect the provisions of any compact to which any one or more of the party states may be a party, nor to supersede, diminish, or otherwise affect any obligation assumed under any such compact. Nor shall anything in this compact be construed to discourage additional interstate compacts among some or all of the party states for the management of natural resources, or the coordination of activities with respect to a specific natural resource or any aspect of natural resource management, or for the establishment of intergovernmental planning agencies in sub-areas of the region. Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit the jurisdiction or activities of any participating government, agency, or officer thereof, or any private person or agency.

"Article X

"Enactment

"A. This compact shall become effective when entered into and enacted into law by any three of the states of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont, and when the United States has provided by law for the designation of its representation on the Commission. Thereafter it shall become effective with respect to any other aforementioned state upon its enacting this compact into law.

"B. Upon consent of the Congress of the United States of America, any other state in the northeastern area may become a party to this compact, by entering into and enacting this compact into law.

"Article XI

"Withdrawal

"This compact shall continue in force and remain binding upon each party state until renounced by it. Renunciation of this compact must be preceded by sending three years' notice in writing of intention to withdraw from the compact to the governor of each of the other states party hereto and to such officers or agencies of the United States as may be designated by federal law.

"Article XII

"Construction and Severability

"The provisions of this compact shall be severable and if any phrase, clause, sentence or provision of this compact is declared to be unconstitutional or the applicability thereof, to any state, agency, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the constitutionality of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof to any other state, agency, person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby. It is the legislative intent that the provisions of this compact be reasonably and liberally construed."

SEC. 2. The consent of Congress is given to any of the States of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont to become a party to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact in accordance with its terms.

SEC. 3. The President is authorized to appoint seven members, representing, and responsible to the heads of, departments or agencies of the United States having principal responsibilities for water and related land resources development, to the Commission created by the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact. All such Federal representatives shall be employees of the United States and shall serve without additional compensation.

SEC. 4. Nothing in the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact or in this Act shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right, power, or jurisdiction of the United States, or any agency thereof, in and over the region which forms the subject of such Compact or as authorizing the Northeastern Resources Commission to impair or in any manner to affect any such right, power, or jurisdiction of the United States, or any agency thereof.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained herein shall be interpreted or construed as authorizing an agreement with the Commission by the United States or an agency thereof for participation of any employees of the Commission in any retirement program established for Federal employees.

SEC. 6. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved, and no change proposed to be made in the Compact approved by the Act shall become effective until it shall have been approved by Congress.

LEIF ERIKSON DAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and my distinguished colleague from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim October 9 of each year as Leif Erikson Day.

The purpose of this joint resolution is to extend belated recognition to Leif Erikson for his achievement in discovering the North American Continent about the year 1000 A.D.

While there are no contemporary written accounts of the early Norse explorations, we do have information that has come to us through sagas that were reduced to a written form at a later date, and through archeological discoveries.

On the basis of colonization alone, the Norse claim is clear. Greenland is more closely associated with the mainland of North America than the islands of the West Indies that Columbus discovered 500 years later. In about the year 984, Erik the Red, the father of Leif Erikson established a colony in Greenland. Norse colonies existed there until about 1450. According to the Catholic Encyclopedia, 16 parishes were established, churches and a few monasteries were built, and at least 16 bishops were nominated to the Gardar Bishopric between the year 1000 and the early part of the 15th century.

However, the Norse claim to the discovery of America does not rest on the colonization of Greenland alone, but is strengthened by subsequent exploration. The records of these voyages to the mainland have been preserved in the "Flateyarbók," the "Hauksbók" and in the vellum codex AM557 in the Arna-Magnaean collection in Copenhagen.

The "Flateyarbók," compiled somewhere around 1390 A.D., is a collection of sagas, short tales, poems, and annals. Among these are two selections the titles of which may be translated as the "Saga of Erik the Red" and the "Tale of the Greenlanders." Most of the material which relates to Leif Erikson's voyage is in the latter. The tale as recounted there is usually referred to as the "Greenland Saga."

The "Hauksbók," another large collection, written around 1330, also contains a "Saga of Erik the Red," which, with minor variations, is preserved also in AM–557. Both appear to have been copied from an earlier manuscript, which is now lost.

Prof. Finnur Jónsson believes that the original story was written about 1200 A.D. or at least not later than the first quarter of the 13th century. The account as presented by these two manuscripts is sometimes referred to as the "Karlsefni Saga" or the "Iceland Saga." In addition to these sagas, there is a brief reference to the Norsemen in Vinland, a name which they applied to a part of the American Continent, in "Descriptio Insularum Aquilonis," a work written by Adam of Bremen around 1070. This is the first authentic reference in world literature to the American Continent.

It appears from the sagas that Leif Erikson, one of three sons of Erik Thorvaldson, was born in Iceland around the year 979. About 985 Erik sailed with his family and a band of followers to establish a settlement in Greenland. He established his new home at Brattahlid in Eriksfjord.

In 999, when he was about 20 years old, Leif set out to see the world. Instead of following the old sailing route by way of Iceland, he boldly set his course directly east across the open ocean to Norway. There he visited King Olaf Trygvason. He spent the winter at the King's court, and there, under Olaf's influence, he became a Christian. When he set out for Greenland the following summer, he took with him a priest and some teachers to undertake the task of converting the settlers in Greenland.

It is at this point in Leif's life that the two versions show a marked discrepancy. According to the "Karlsefni Saga," Leif, on his return from Norway,

probably in the year 1000, was carried far out of his course by contrary winds, and his ship was driven into unknown seas. After a considerable period of drift, he came upon new lands, on which grew self-sown wheat fields, vines, and large trees, before finding his way home to Greenland.

The "Greenland Saga" tells us that the first white man to sight American shores was Bjarni Herjulfson, who, however, did not land there; and that Leif's expedition, in the year 1002 or later, was a planned one to explore the lands previously sighted by Herjulfson. Landing first at a place they called Helluland, and then at a level, wooded land which they named Markland, they came at last to a region where wild grapes grew. At this place, which they called Vinland, they erected houses and spent the winter. They sent out exploring parties, each having orders to go no further than the distance from which the adventurers could return by evening. In the spring, with a cargo of timber, they made their way back to Greenland.

Scholars have studied these documents carefully in the light of both internal and external criticism. They have discovered what appear to be interpolations made at a later date. They have subjected them to almost endless interpretation. There has been disagreement on details, particularly as to the exact year of Leif's first landing on the American continent and the exact location of that landing. Various writers have fixed the location of Vinland at points from Labrador to Georgia. However, scholars have found an area of agreement on the fundamental fact—that Leif Erikson did land at least once on the American continent and spent some time there, probably staying over the winter and returning to Greenland in the spring.

Nor was the discovery of America by Leif Erikson an isolated incident. It was rather the first of a series of exploratory voyages and attempts at colonization carried on by Thorvald Erikson, Thorstein Erikson, Thorfinn Karlsefni, and Freydís, Erik's daughter, over the next few years. Recently remains of ancient buildings have been excavated on the coast of Newfoundland. It has been determined by carbon tests that artifacts found there date from about the year 1000. It seems probable that the buildings belonged to Leif or to one of the expeditions made in the years immediately following.

Sometime after 1340 the western settlement in Greenland completely disappeared. In 1354 Magnus Erickson, King of Norway and Sweden, appointed Paul Knutson leader of an expedition to locate and bring back to the Christian faith the colonists who had left the western settlement. There is some evidence to indicate that a part of this expedition penetrated as far as Minnesota, probably by way of Hudson Bay, around the year 1362. The rest of the expedition returned to Norway in 1364. Nicholas of Lynn, an Englishman who is believed to have accompanied the expedition, wrote a report, "Inventio Fortunata," no copies of which are known to exist. It is not improbable that Columbus had knowledge of that report.

The Norse expeditions, and particularly the discovery of North America by Leif Erikson, can no longer be regarded as myths. The sources have been examined and studied too carefully for that. The time is long overdue for the recognition of Leif Erikson's role in the discovery of the New World.

This joint resolution acknowledges this historic and courageous achievement by providing for the designation of October 9 of each year as Leif Erikson Day, by Presidential proclamation, and by encouraging its observance by suitable exercises in schools and churches. October 9 has traditionally been observed as Leif Erikson Day by many Scandinavian groups through the years. Its proximity to Columbus Day provides an opportunity for Americans to celebrate the heroic explorations of both these great discoverers at the same time.

Mr. President, my Democratic colleagues from Minnesota in the House will be introducing similar joint resolutions in the near future. I am particularly pleased to have the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] as the coauthor of this proposal. His abiding interest in the accomplishments of his Scandinavian ancestors is well known and his advocacy of this resolution will be a significant factor in achieving its passage in the Senate and House. I know his enthusiasm for a national Leif Erikson Day equals, and perhaps even surpasses, my own.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this joint resolution be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution remain at the desk for an additional 3 days so that other Senators may become cosponsors if they so desire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 76) to authorize the President to proclaim October 9 in each year as Leif Erikson Day, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Leif Erikson did make the original discovery by nonnative Americans of the North American Continent in about the year A.D. 1000, and subsequently explored portions thereof; and

Whereas proof of this historical fact rests solidly, not only on two independent accounts in the Norse sagas, but on archeological discoveries and evidence from the archives of European libraries; and

Whereas the fact of this discovery is further supported by the writings of numerous historians, and in encyclopedias and textbooks for school use; and

Whereas it is fitting that due recognition should be accorded to this historic exploit in early American history: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to officially proclaim October 9 in each year as Leif Erikson Day, and to issue annually a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on such day, inviting the people of the United States to observe such day in schools, churches, and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

FEDERAL AND STATE PROGRAMS RELATING TO OUTDOOR RECREATION

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on Senate bill 20.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert the following:

That the Congress finds and declares it to be desirable that all American people of present and future generations be assured adequate outdoor recreation resources, and that it is desirable for all levels of government and private interests to take prompt and coordinated action to the extent practicable without diminishing or affecting their respective powers and functions to conserve, develop, and utilize such resources for the benefit and enjoyment of the American people.

SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to perform the following functions and activities:

(a) INVENTORY.—Prepare and maintain a continuing inventory and evaluation of outdoor recreation needs and resources of the United States.

(b) CLASSIFICATION.—Prepare a system for classification of outdoor recreation resources to assist in the effective and beneficial use and management of such resources.

(c) NATIONWIDE PLAN.—Formulate and maintain a comprehensive nationwide outdoor recreation plan, taking into consideration the plans of the various Federal agencies, States, and their political subdivisions. The plan shall set forth the needs and demands of the public for outdoor recreation and the current and foreseeable availability in the future of outdoor recreation resources to meet those needs. The plan shall identify critical outdoor recreation problems, recommend solutions, and recommend desirable actions to be taken at each level of government and by private interests. The Secretary shall transmit the initial plan, which shall be prepared as soon as practicable within five years hereafter, to the President for transmittal to the Congress. Future revisions of the plan shall be similarly transmitted at succeeding five-year intervals. When a plan or revision is transmitted to the Congress, the Secretary shall transmit copies to the Governors of the several States.

(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Provide technical assistance and advice to and cooperate with States, political subdivisions, and private interests, including nonprofit organizations, with respect to outdoor recreation.

(e) REGIONAL COOPERATION.—Encourage interstate and regional cooperation in the

planning, acquisition, and development of outdoor recreation resources.

(f) RESEARCH AND EDUCATION.—(1) Sponsor, engage in, and assist in research relating to outdoor recreation, directly or by contract or cooperative agreements, and make payments for such purposes without regard to the limitations of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529) concerning advances of funds when he considers such action in the public interest, (2) undertake studies and assemble information concerning outdoor recreation, directly or by contract or cooperative agreement, and disseminate such information without regard to the provisions of section 4154, title 39, United States Code, and (3) cooperate with educational institutions and others in order to assist in establishing education programs and activities and to encourage public use and benefits from outdoor recreation.

(g) INTERDEPARTMENTAL COOPERATION.—(1) Cooperate with and provide technical assistance to Federal departments and agencies and obtain from them information, data, reports, advice, and assistance that are needed and can reasonably be furnished in carrying out the purposes of this Act, and (2) promote coordination of Federal plans and activities generally relating to outdoor recreation. Any department or agency furnishing advice or assistance hereunder may expend its own funds for such purposes, with or without reimbursement, as may be agreed to by that agency.

(h) DONATIONS.—Accept and use donations of money, property, personal services, or facilities for the purposes of this Act: *Provided, however,* That within 60 days following the close of each calendar year, the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the Congress a report for each such calendar year which report shall itemize with particularity and describe in detail the source, value, purpose and use of each donation of money, property, personal services or facilities accepted or used under authority of this Act.

SEC. 3. In order further to carry out the policy declared in section 1 of this Act, the heads of Federal departments and independent agencies having administrative responsibility over activities or resources the conduct or use of which is pertinent to fulfillment of that policy shall, either individually or as a group, (a) consult with and be consulted by the Secretary from time to time both with respect to their conduct of those activities and their use of those resources and with respect to the activities which the Secretary of the Interior carries on under authority of this Act which are pertinent to their work, and (b) carry out such responsibilities in general conformance with the nationwide plan authorized under section 2(c) of this Act.

SEC. 4. As used in this Act, the term "United States" shall include the District of Columbia and the terms "United States" and "States" may, to the extent practicable, include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, but not more than $2,500,000 per year, as are required to carry out the purposes of this Act.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to promote the coordination and development of effective programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes."

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments adopted by the House of Representatives, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JACKSON, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. ALLOTT the conferees on the part of the Senate.

REVISION OF FEDERAL ELECTION LAWS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 559) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes, the name of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] be added as a cosponsor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY OF VETERANS HAVING DEAFNESS OF BOTH EARS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 141, House bill 199.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (H.R. 199) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 157), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

H.R. 199 authorizes the payment of additional compensation in the amount of $47 per month to a veteran who has a service-incurred disability of deafness of both ears, with absence of air and bone conduction.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Congress has long maintained a system of statutory awards for compensating veterans who has specified service-connected disabilities, the award being in addition to the basic rate of compensation. For example, a veteran who has lost an arm above the elbow could be rated at 80 percent resulting in the monthly payment of basic compensation in the amount of $170. In addition to this amount he would receive as a result of the statutory award law, $47, making his total monthly compensation $217.

Under the current schedule for rating disabilities, total deafness is ratable at 80-percent disabling, which results in compensation for wartime cases of $170 monthly. This present 80-percent rate is a reduction ordered at the discretion of the Administrator from the previous 100-percent rating. The passage of this legislation would result in the veteran who suffers from total deafness receiving $170 monthly for his wartime disability, plus $47, to make a total of $217.

The Veterans' Administration estimates that there are approximately 1,200 cases who would be eligible for this statutory award at a minimum additional cost of $666,000 the first year. There would be a slight increase each year for the succeeding 4 years.

INCREASES IN RATES OF DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION PAYABLE TO CHILDREN AND PARENTS OF DECEASED VETERANS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 142, House bill 211.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (H.R. 211) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to children and parents of deceased veterans was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 158), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 211 is to increase by 10 percent (with fractions rounded off to next higher dollar) the monthly rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable for eligible parents and children of veterans dying of service-connected causes.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Chapter 13 of title 38, United States Code (dependency and indemnity compensation), restates a portion of the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act (Public Law 881, 84th Cong., Aug. 1, 1956). This act established a new and modernized benefits program of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of veterans dying from service-connected causes on or after January 1, 1957.

The rate of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows is geared to basic active service pay. As the service pay is increased the widows' rates under this program are automatically increased. The basic service pay was last increased June 1, 1958. This automatic adjustment is not applicable to the monthly rates for parents (38 U.S.C. 415), children (38 U.S.C. 413–414), or the allowance to widows with children (38 U.S.C. 411(b)) in cases where payments under the Railroad Retirement Act, Social Security Act, or 38 U.S.C. 412 is below a certain amount.

H.R. 211 proposes to increase by 10 percent (with fractions rounded off to the next higher dollar) the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation not subject to automatic adjustment. These rates have not been changed since they were established.

In his budget message of January 17, 1963, the President recommended a cost-of-living increase for the groups covered by this bill. The increase in the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation proposed by H.R. 211 is commensurate with the increased cost of living since the rates in question were established.

The effect of this legislation is as shown in the following tables (italics indicate rates in H.R. 211).

Rates of dependency and indemnity compensation to widows, children, and parents for service-connected death occurring on or after Jan. 1, 1957 [1] [2]

Widows[3] and children	Children, no widow
Widow alone: $112 per month, plus 12 per centum of basic pay of deceased husband, with total amount adjusted to next highest dollar. Rates range from $122 in an E–1 case with less than 2 years' service to $316 in case of an O–10 with over 30 years' service. If deceased was serving as Chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, or Commandant of the Marine Corps, regardless of cumulative years of service the widow's rate is $337.	Children under age 18: 1 child, $70 ($77). 2 children, $100 ($110) (equally divided). 3 children, $130 ($143) (equally divided), plus $25 ($28) for each child in excess of 3 (equally divided).
Widow and 1 child under age 18: Same as amount payable to widow alone.	
Widow and 2 or more children under age 18: Same rate as that payable to widow alone with following exception: Where total amount payable under the Railroad Retirement Act or Social Security Act, or under sec. 412 of title 38, U.S.C. (veterans' benefits), based upon an assumed fully and currently insured status, is less than $128, the compensation payable to widow by VA increased by $25 ($28) for each child in excess of 1, but the total increase may not exceed the difference between the amounts payable under the above and $128.	Child age 18 or above who became permanently incapable of self-support prior to that age: $95 ($105) (basic $70 ($77) rate increased by $25 ($28); total rate with $25 ($28) supplement variable where there are other children).
Widow and child or children age 18 and above permanently incapable of self-support where incapacity began under age 18: Regular widow's rate payable to widow, plus $70 ($77) for each such child payable to child.	Child or children ages 18 to 21 attending school: Same as basic rate payable to children under age 18 where there is no widow. (Payment barred if child commences program of war orphans' educational assistance.)
Widow and child or children age 18 but under 21 attending school: Regular widow's rate payable to widow, plus $35 ($39) payable to each such child. (Payment barred if child commences program of war orphans' educational assistance.)	

1 PARENT ONLY

Total annual income		Monthly rate
More than—	But equal to or less than—	
	$750	$75 ($83)
$750	$1,000	60 (66)
$1,000	$1,250	45 (50)
$1,250	$1,500	30 (33)
$1,500	$1,750	15 (17)
$1,750		0

2 PARENTS LIVING TOGETHER [4]

Combined annual income		Monthly rate to each
More than—	But equal to or less than—	
	$1,000	$50 ($55)
$1,000	$1,350	40 (44)
$1,350	$1,700	30 (33)
$1,700	$2,050	20 (22)
$2,050	$2,400	10 (11)
$2,400		0

2 PARENTS NOT LIVING TOGETHER

Total annual income of parent		Individual rate
More than—	But equal to or less than—	
	$750	$50 ($55)
$750	$1,000	40 (44)
$1,000	$1,250	30 (33)
$1,250	$1,500	20 (22)
$1,500	$1,750	10 (11)
$1,750		0

[1] Persons eligible for death compensation based on death occurring before Jan. 1, 1957, may, under certain conditions, apply for and receive dependency and indemnity compensation.

[2] Except in certain missing persons cases the dependents of veterans who die on or after May 1, 1957, while their life-insurance premiums are waived pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 724 (formerly sec. 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended) are not eligible to receive dependency and indemnity compensation but may be paid death compensation notwithstanding the fact the death occurred after Dec. 31, 1956.

[3] The term "widow" includes the widower of any female veteran if such widower is incapable of self-maintenance and was permanently incapable of self-support due to physical or mental disability at the time of the veteran's death.

[4] Applies also to remarried parent living with spouse, with income of spouse counted.

DEPARTMENTAL VIEWS

The Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget favor enactment of this legislation.

COST ESTIMATE

The Veterans' Administration estimated the bill would benefit the first year 44,900 children at a cost of $3,082,000 (secs. 2 and 3) and 30,900 parents at a cost of $1,743,000 (sec. 4). It was estimated that the cost of section 1 of the bill would not exceed $209,000. The total first year's additional cost of the bill was thus estimated to be approximately $5 million. It is the belief of the Veterans' Administration that the additional cost will decrease slightly for the next 4 years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am happy that House bill 211, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to children and parents of deceased veterans has finally been passed. The struggle to have it passed has been a long one, but has been most worthwhile. The passage of this bill is overdue; but at last the bill has been considered and passed, and I think this is a great day for the dependents of our deceased veterans.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS HAVING COMPLETE APHONIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 143, House bill 214.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (H.R. 214) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, with resulting complete aphonia, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 159), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

H.R. 214, authorizing the payment of additional compensation of $47 per month to a veteran who has a service-incurred disability of complete organic aphonia (loss of speech).

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The current Schedule for Rating Disabilities provides that complete organic aphonia (loss of speech) with constant inability to communicate by speech will be rated as totally disabling with compensation payable in the total amount of $250 a month. This bill provides that the statutory award rate ($47) now applicable for other appropriate disabilities for a specific loss shall be added to the total rate. This $47 a month allowance would mean that the veteran would receive $297 monthly if this bill is enacted into law.

The Veterans' Administration indicates that there are only twenty known cases involving complete organic aphonia meeting the criteria of this bill, which means that the annual cost would be $11,280.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, these are three very important bills. All have been reported from the Finance Committee, under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. They were reported unanimously by the Finance Committee; and they were reported unanimously from the policy committee; and, so far as I know, they have the unanimous support of the Members on the Republican side.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. As a member of the Finance Committee, I wish to say that I was present when these bills were considered by it. They were unanimously approved by the committee, and the committee was proud and pleased to do so.

COMMENDATION FOR PRESERVATION OF SECRECY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, while the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] are on the floor—both of whom, along with me, had some remarks to make in regard to the secrecy of the recent secret session of the Senate—I invite attention to the fact that several weeks have now transpired since that secret session was held; and, so far as I have been able to read, notice, or hear, there have been absolutely no "leaks" from that secret session of the Senate. For that, I wish to commend Senators and to express my own appreciation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the Senator from Tennessee has seen fit to make that statement, because it is accurate and true; and it speaks well for the fact that we did, in an extraordinary secret session, discuss many things, none of which, so far, at least, has reached the public or to the press.

MIDDLESEX CONCRETE PRODUCTS AND EXCAVATING CORP.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 145, Senate bill 1003.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (S. 1003) for the relief of the Middlesex Concrete Products & Excavating Corp., was considered, order to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Middlesex Concrete Products and Excavating Corporation, of Woodbridge, New Jersey, the sum of $1,600, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for additional compensation for work performed at the direction of the Department of the Army in excess of the requirements of contract numbered DA-30-075-Eng-8601 for the construction of permanent family housing site work (outside lease lines) at Fort Wadsworth, New York, the Department of the Army being unable to pay such additional compensation because of the limitation on the expenditure of funds for such site work contained in section 505 of the Act of September 28, 1951 (12 U.S.C. 1748i).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 162), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to pay to the Middlesex Concrete Products & Excavating Corp., of Woodbridge, N.J., the sum of $1,600 in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for additional compensation for work performed at the direction of the Department of the Army in excess of the requirements of contract No. DA-30-075-Eng-8601 for the construction of permanent family housing site work (outside lease lines) at Fort Wadsworth, N.Y., the Department of the Army being unable to pay such additional compensation because of the limitation on the expenditure of funds for such site work contained in section 505 of the act of September 28, 1951 (12 U.S.C. 17481).

STATEMENT

The Department of the Army has no objection to the enactment of this legislation.

The claimant entered into a contract with the U.S. Government for permanent housing site work and utilities outside the Capehart lease boundary line within Fort Wadsworth, N.Y., in the amount of $77,364. The contract was awarded by the U.S. Army Engineer District, N.Y. Subsequently the contractor submitted a claim for $5,825 additional compensation covering alleged extra work performed in installing 470 feet of 8-inch water distribution main with fittings and valves. The claimant corporation alleged that it was required to do the work by the contracting officer even though it was not required to be constructed under the terms of the contract, since the lease boundary line was not indicated on the pertinent drawing. The claim was denied by the contracting officer, who found that although the lease boundary line was not shown on the drawing, it was shown on a large scale portion of the same drawing and could be established readily on the other drawing by scaling.

The division engineer reviewed the claim and determined that an ambiguity existed in the drawings relative to the new 8-inch water line and that this was misleading to a reasonably prudent bidder and, therefore, the contractor should be compensated for this additional work under the contract.

Subsequently, new negotiations were made between the Corps of Engineers and the Middlesex Corp. and it was agreed that $4,000 was due the contractor. The Army had already allocated funds within $2,400 of the maximum allowable. The contractor was paid this $2,400, leaving a balance due of $1,600.

The report of the Department of the Army indicates that the only reason for not paying this balance was the absence of available funds and that "it would be against justice and good conscience for the Government to accept the work performed without compensating the contractor. Therefore, this Department interposes no objection to the bill."

In view of all of the foregoing, the committee concurs in the report of the Department of the Army and recommends that the bill, S. 1003, be considered favorably.

THIRTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF WOMEN'S LEAGUE OF ISRAEL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the 35th birthday anniversary of the Women's League for Israel, an organization of 20,000 American women who have made extraordinarily fine contributions to America's interest in Israel and have taken many constructive actions for the benefit of the young people who are making their homes and seeking their opportunities there.

The Women's League has established centers in Israel which have been likened to our own "Y" centers, and at one time were characterized as "a home away from home, located in the spiritual home of all mankind, Israel," by the late Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, during the course of one of her visits to the Holy Land.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a recent editorial by the Seven Arts Feature Syndicate of New York entitled "Memorable Anniversary," which summarizes the fine record of this women's group and lauds its accomplishments.

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORABLE ANNIVERSARY

The three and one-half decades of service to the young people of Israel being marked this year by the Women's League for Israel, which is now observing its 35th anniversary, covers a vital period in the life of the organization.

Since its official founding in 1928, the league has helped close to 50,000 persons in its five Israeli homes—one in Jerusalem, two in Haifa, one in Tel Aviv, and one at Nathanya, where it also maintains a training center for the blind.

Headed by Mrs. Ann Cahane-Neiditz as president, the league has accomplished a great deal. It has received and absorbed the newcomers, integrating the many victims of oppression and homelessness, training the handicapped to self-sufficiency, and now, is aiding future Israeli leaders and students from many lands to a university education in an atmosphere of freedom and democracy.

This year the league will complete construction of a new $500,000 three-unit university student center in Jerusalem at the Hebrew University, where it has already built dormitories, a student cafeteria, and donated funds to maintain a chair in sociology.

The league's history mirrors recent tragedies and joys of millions of the Jewish faith. Convinced as early as 1928 that no adequate housing existed for young women arriving to live in the Yishuv (Jewish settlements), the group pledged its resources to provide its first home for women in Haifa.

The tragic massacre at Hebron in 1929, brought the decision from Yishuv leaders that serious measures for self-defense of the settlements were needed. The league similarly decided that its building program must be accompanied by training and integrating facilities for the new immigrants. The Hitler holocaust increased the already speedy tempo of its work.

Its greatest satisfaction came of course with the arrival of the independence of Israel, for the organization had worked hard toward its achievement.

On its 35th anniversary I commend the league for its dedication and accomplishments.

DESEGREGATED HOSPITAL FACILITIES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD three papers of an article from the American Journal of Public Health, April 1963, entitled "Achieving Equal Opportunity in Use of Medical Service and Hospital Facilities." The papers are by Richard V. Marks, secretary-director, Detroit Commission on Human Relations; the Right Reverend Richard S. Emrich, bishop of Michigan, Protestant Episcopal Church, Detroit; and Dietrich C. Reitzes, Ph. D., deputy director, Commission on Youth Welfare, Chicago, Ill.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACHIEVING EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN THE USE OF MEDICAL SERVICES AND HOSPITAL FACILITIES

(The need to make health services and facilities available to all regardless of race, creed, or national origin is today accepted as a basic principle of a democratic society. One of our national problems is the fact that this principle has not yet been fully implemented. The following three papers offer the experience of one community, Detroit, in endeavoring to deal with this problem as it affected the Negro population. Certain conclusions are drawn.)

I. THE CATALYTIC ROLE OF GOVERNMENTAL HUMAN RELATIONS AGENCIES

(By Richard V. Marks)

Basic to the medical profession and to a democratic society is the belief that medicine must be available to all men. In the Detroit area, local government has attempted to implement this principle and insure the availability of medical care to all persons regardless of economic status, race, religion, or national origin. We can give service to the financially distressed in public hospitals, but what can a community do to guarantee competent, adequate service to all persons seeking private medical consultation and treatment?

The Mayor's Interracial Committee, Detroit's first intergroup agency, addressed

itself to this question early in 1952. In our area, as in many other urban centers, hospital facilities, medical personnel, and training opportunities were generally inadequate, and the problem of servicing the needs of the community's Negro population, which had doubled in one decade, was acute.

Many persons in our community voiced the belief that racial discrimination within the field of medicine was placing minority group members at a disadvantage and that this inequity must be eliminated. The occasion of our city's first study of hospital facilities, resources, and needs in relation to our total population became the focus around which these community concerns were expressed. When the study of needs was complete and a plan for using Federal funds in conjunction with the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act was initiated along with the raising of $19 million in private construction funds, the issue of "who" would participate became a question of communitywide significance.

This was clearly a situation which deserved the attention of the medical profession and the city's intergroup agency. The Mayor's Interracial Committee and its successor, the Detroit Commission on Community Relations, were assigned a responsibility "* * * to promote good will, and to cultivate responsibility for the common welfare." It "shall seek to correct situations * * * endangering the peace and welfare * * * or to be unjust and discriminatory." It shall do these things "* * * through negotiation and conciliation."

In fulfilling its responsibility, the commission attempts to find community solutions to community problems and depends upon civic leadership and support in these undertakings. With the belief that discrimination in health services is unjust and causes dissatisfaction and tension in the community, the commission created citizens' committees.

The Medical and Hospital Study Committee was created in 1952, under the sponsorship of the Mayor's Interracial Committee, and accepted as its responsibility the task of surveying the racial factors in the field of medical training, service, and the facilities for the care of the ill in the Detroit metropolitan area. The factfinding activities of this committee were completed in 1956 with the publication of the Medical and Hospital Study Committee's Reports.

A second citizens' committee, the Advisory Committee on Hospitals, was established in 1957 to implement the recommendations of the study committee and seeks to correct unfair practices outlined in the original study.

The importance of the committee approach in solving community problems has been demonstrated many times over, and the success of any committee program is dependent upon its personnel. It was the intent of the commission to bring together representative citizens of good will who had an appreciation for the problems to be studied and a desire to work toward a resolution.

Leaders in many fields have brought not only status to the program of the study committee and the advisory committee, but dedication to the goal of achieving nondiscrimination in all phases of medicine and hospital operations in Detroit. The varied interests in our community represented on the committees included business, labor, church, community (including minority groups) and professional, medical, nursing, and hospital leaders. With singleness of purposes, the membership reviewed racial factors in hospital policy and practice and explored logical and efficient means for eliminating discrimination based upon race, creed, color, or national origin. Persons were asked to serve who were involved in the problem and in its solution. At the outset they were chosen for committee membership on the basis of their recognition that a racial problem did in fact exist. Their job became one of honestly setting forth the facts and finding avenues of solution.

Within the framework of their general assignments, the committees functioned as autonomous groups, with complete freedom to shape their own policies, define the scope and form of the study, and the contents of their reports.

In the sequence of committee activity, the study was first defined through the selection of six specific areas for investigation. The survey itself was designed to determine the extent of the problem in each of these areas.

Institutions were asked to state policy governing selection of personnel and trainees in the areas of nurse training, medical training, medical staff, nursing staff, and nursing service, and hospitals indicated their bed assignment policies. Data, furnished and in some instances interpreted by hospitals and other training institutions, illustrated current practices in the areas under study. The committee in subgroups and as a whole analyzed all available information to determine if the patterns, as they emerged in the various categories, suggested the exclusion of or segregation of minority group members.

The study committee discharged its full responsibility in 1956 with the reports of findings, conclusions, and recommendations for the clarification and implementation of nondiscriminatory policies.

As a result of committee conferences, the State Office of Hospital Survey and Construction, in 1958, required a declaration and guarantee of nondiscrimination from all recipients of Federal funds. In 1960, the Detroit Area Hospital Council publicly supported our community goal and urged all member hospitals to adopt statements of nondiscrimination similar to the one suggested by the State agency. The Metropolitan Detroit Building Fund for Hospital Construction has also indicated a willingness to include a clear policy requirement in all contract agreements. Each report of the advisory committee marks a step toward the achievement of our eventual goal and recognizes the adoption of and demonstration of a nonrestrictive policy within a category of institutions. Thus in 1957, progress with the college nursing schools was reported; in 1958, the report of medical schools was issued; and the committee report of enrollment policies of hospital nursing schools was made public in 1959.

The committee began the resurvey of individual hospitals offering medical training programs in 1959. Here again, significant progress has been made as a result of lengthy negotiations. One major medical training hospital has not only adopted a satisfactory policy but has agreed to implement this policy through a program of informal recruitment of qualified Negro medical school graduates.

In none of its negotiations has the committee advocated the revision of professional standards; the emphasis has been upon the application of these standards without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin.

Detroit's redevelopment project application for the medical center area provided a situation for accelerating our community goal of equal opportunity in medicine. The chairman of the advisory committee and commission staff participated in conferences, convened by the mayor of Detroit, to discuss and resolve the community controversy arising over the use of Federal and city funds for the expansion of institutions charged with the practice of discrimination. In early 1961, the four hospitals within this area, all offering medical training programs, submitted declarations of commitment to a policy of nondiscrimination in all phases of their operations. Not all these hospitals are moving ahead "with deliberate speed." At least one of these hospitals is acting on its pledge with such reluctance as to endanger the entire program.

The business of changing established practices in our society is slow. Such attempts meet with organized and individual resistance. The progress we have made, however, strengthens our position as we meet new situations.

Next steps in our program include contact with Blue Cross-Blue Shield and the medical society to ask for their active endorsement of democratic practices within the profession, continued conferences with hospitals offering medical training opportunities to urge a clearly demonstrated policy of inclusiveness, and contact with hospitals not offering training on the matter of staff appointments and bed assignment policies.

Detroit has benefited greatly through the operation of its citizens' committees. Outstanding persons have given of their time and influence to become knowledgeable in the area of medicine, to plan a realistic corrective program, and to carry out this program with determination. These committees have successfully interpreted the concerns of the community to hospitals and other institutions and have helped the community understand better some of the administrative and professional problems within the field of medicine.

Over the past 9 years, Detroit has been investigating itself to define the real problem in the area of discrimination in medicine and attempting to correct practices which are unjust and which create tension in our community. Our goal is as worthy of support and conscientious effort today as it was in 1952 and the problems which remain are as great a handicap to our city and the medical profession as the ones now behind us. We are grateful for the opportunity to discuss and describe our methods and techniques in the belief that our success can be duplicated in other American communities.

II. ACTIVITIES OF THE CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON HOSPITALS OF THE DETROIT COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY RELATIONS

(By the Right Reverend Richard S. Emrich, Ph. D., D.D.)

Background

The medical and hospital study committee was created in 1952 for the purpose of reviewing racial factors in hospital policy and practice and recommending logical and efficient means for eliminating this problem in our community. The committee was sponsored by the mayor's interracial committee, predecessor of the present commission on community relations. Staff services for the study committee were provided by the interracial committee. Following its review, the study committee, composed of 35 distinguished citizens representing all aspects of Detroit's community life, issued six reports on the major phases of hospital and medical services: Nurse training and employment; medical training, including medical schools and internship and residency training programs; medical staff appointments; and bed utilization and assignment practices in 47 Detroit area hospitals. In its reports, the committee dealt only with the scope of the problem; it did not single out any hospital or institution by name. The medical and hospital study committee completed its work in the summer of 1956, when it submitted its reports of findings and recommendations to the Detroit Commission on Community Relations, and thus to the public.

The study committee found some serious problem in the areas studied. For example, only two of the nine hospital-affiliated nurse training schools had any record of consistent enrollment of qualified Negro students. Only 4 of the approximately 20 hospitals offering internship training had any record of accepting Negro interns. Comparatively few of the 170 Negro physicians in Detroit held staff appointments in the voluntary nonprofit hospitals. Except for governmental

hospitals, patient segregation in wards and semiprivate rooms was the prevailing pattern.

Advisory committee on hospitals

In 1957, the commission on community relations created the present advisory committee on hospitals to implement the recommendations made by the study committee. Its goal is that Detroit lead the Nation in achieving a completely nondiscriminatory, equal opportunity system of medical and hospital practice. The 20 members of the committee are leaders in business, labor, medicine, nursing, and the religious and civic life of the city. Staff services for the committee are provided by the commission.

The advisory committee has approached the problem on three levels: (1) The individual hospital or institution; (2) hospital planning and funding organizations; and (3) governmental action.

Achievements

1. On the level of individual hospitals, the advisory committee concentrates its attention on one category of hospitals or institutions at a time. Thus the 2 schools of medicine, the 2 colleges of nursing, the 7 hospitals now offering nurse training, and the 10 additional hospitals offering internship and residency training programs have been resurveyed as groups by the committee. Where necessary, negotiations have been undertaken with the administration and board of trustees of institutions whose practices have been found to fall short of the standards enunciated by the study committee. When the resurvey and negotiations are satisfactorily completed for the institutions in a category, the advisory committee submits its report on the institutions to the commission on community relations. At this time, the committee reports become public information.

Following this procedure, the advisory committee has reported that the Schools of Medicine at Wayne State University and the University of Michigan and the Schools of Nursing at Mercy College and Wayne State University have demonstrated their openness to all qualified students. The report on the seven hospital-affiliated schools of nursing stated that six had satisfactorily demonstrated nonrestrictive policy and practice in admission to the schools. The board of trustees of the seventh hospital assured the committee that the enrollment of its school of nursing would reflect an inclusive pattern of admissions at the earliest opportunity. Subsequent to the publication of the committee's report that school enrolled its first Negro student nurse.

The committee is presently resurveying and conducting negotiations with hospitals offering internship and residency training programs. The committee is now concentrating its attention on negotiations with the major teaching hospitals in the Detroit area. Progress is slow, partly because of the unavoidable lag between the making of a policy decision and the demonstrated implementation of that decision, and partly because of reluctance on the part of some institutions to recognize any responsibility for the solution of problems called to their attention, or, in some cases, to recognize the existence of such problems. To date, no hospital has been certified by the committee as being free of discriminatory practices in all phases of its operation.

2. On the level of hospital planning and funding organizations, the advisory committee has concluded an agreement with the Michigan Office of Hospital Survey and Construction that, pursuant to its obligations under Federal law, no hospital would receive public funds for the construction of any facility unless it could provide guarantees that it was either operating without reference to race in the service of people, or could guarantee and covenant that it would so operate. The State office developed a model resolution of nondiscriminatory policy whose adoption is required of hospitals seeking funds under the provisions of the Hill-Burton Act. This resolution states:

"That the Board of Trustees of ——— Hospital does hereby certify that all phases of the operation of ——— Hospital shall be without discrimination against individuals or groups of individuals on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin and that the administrator of ——— Hospital is hereby directed to take such action as is necessary to assure that ——— Hospital shall in fact be so operated."

Following this action by the office of hospital survey and construction the advisory committee called the resolution to the attention of the governing bodies of the hospital planning and coordinating agency and of the major fundraising organization, urging their endorsement and adoption of the policy resolution. Following exploratory discussions with members of the advisory committee, the executive committee of the Greater Detroit Area Hospital Council, Inc., adopted a resolution recommending nondiscriminatory policy and practice by member hospitals, and further recommended their adoption of the above resolution. The hospital council serves as the planning and coordinating agency for 70 member hospitals in the Greater Detroit area.

Similarly, at the advisory committee's suggestion and following discussions and negotiations with the committee, the allocations committee of the Metropolitan Detroit building fund moved to incorporate the resolution in its statement of principles and in its contracts with fund recipients. The building fund is a private organization which raises funds for hospital construction and expansion through the contributions of businesses, foundations, and individuals.

3. Early in 1960, the chairman of the advisory committee was invited to assist in the resolution of the community controversy which arose in regard to the medical center redevelopment plan. This urban redevelopment proposal calls for the clearing of some 200 acres in the heart of the city, and the development of a center for medical research, education, and service. At the Detroit Common Council's hearings on approval of the plan, three organizations endorsed the project as worth while, but would not permit the project to proceed until the practices of racial discrimination charged against three of the four hospitals, which would form the nucleus of the center, were corrected. At the suggestion of the chairman, the nondiscriminatory policy resolution quoted above was submitted to the boards of trustees of the four hospitals and adopted. This action was accepted by all parties, and the common council, on receiving the chairman's report of the action, approved the plan.

The events reported here represent significant progress toward the advisory committee on hospitals' goal of a completely nondiscriminatory, equal opportunity system of medical and hospital practice in the Detroit area. However, much work remains before that goal is fully realized.

III. THE DETROIT EXPERIENCE IN THE NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

(By Dietrich C. Reitzes, Ph. D.)

Supply of medical personnel

An increasing U.S. population requires increases in the supply of trained medical personnel. This is particularly true for the Negro population of the United States. Without implying that Negroes should be taken care of by Negro physicians, it can be shown that, to a large extent, the medical care received by Negroes in this country depends upon the number and quality of Negro physicians. The number of Negro physicians in this country is inadequate. Negroes constitute approximately 10 percent of the entire U.S. population. Negro physicians, however, constitute only 2 percent of all U.S. physicians. Physician population ratios show that there are 132 physicians for every 100,000 population, but there are only 20 Negro physicians for every 100,000 Negro population in this country.

Without an increased effort to do something about this problem, the situation will not improve. While there has been an increase in the number of Negroes attending medical schools, particularly in predominantly white medical schools, Negro students still represent only about 3 percent of the total enrollment in medical schools. Less than 200 Negroes graduate from all medical schools a year. In regard to advanced training of Negro physicians, there has been an improvement. Negro physicians who are certified by the American Specialty Boards have increased 400 percent since 1947 to a total of 369. Yet, even with this increase, only 0.6 percent of all board certified specialists are Negroes.

Patterns of racial integration in medicine

Medical Schools

Today, the shortage of Negro medical students is due primarily to a shortage of qualified Negro applicants to medical schools rather than discrimination on the part of medical schools. This shortage, in turn, is due to:

(a) Discrimination at levels below the medical schools. This means the general problem of discrimination in our society and discrimination in educational opportunities at the lower levels.

(b) The opening up of other professional opportunities for qualified Negroes.

Internships

At the present time this provides no problems for Negro graduates of medical schools. Under the old ghetto system a Negro medical graduate was forced to serve his internship in one of about 10 approved Negro hospitals or go without, save for occasional openings in big northern hospitals like Bellevue in New York City and Cook County in Chicago. Today, under what is called the matching plan, nearly all Negro medical graduates receive acceptances for internship at two, three, or even more hospitals, so that during the last several years the graduates of Howard and Meharry alone have been distributed to about 55 hospitals for their internships. Most of these hospitals have been in the North or West, but some, like the hospitals of the University of Texas and the Medical College of Virginia, have been in the South.

These increased internship openings have resulted chiefly from the fact that there are about 5,000 more approved internships than medical graduates annually. More liberal attitudes, however, have also been a factor.

Residents Training

Essentially, the same situation prevails here as regards to internships.

Advanced Training

The major problem in this area is to find qualified Negro physicians willing to do advanced work beyond board certification. National Medical Fellowships, Inc., which provides scholarships and fellowships for Negro physicians discontinued its program of advanced fellowship simply because there were not enough applicants.

Hospital Staff Appointments

There is general consensus among physicians and medical educators that the most important single factor which determines the kind of medical care that physicians can provide is the opportunity that physicians have for continued education through hospital affiliation. Since private patients are admitted to hospitals through their physicians, the accessibility of hospital beds to

Negro patients is related to these appointments of Negro physicians. This is the area in which the problem of racial discrimination in medical care is greatest across the country.

Factors affecting integration in medicine on the community level

In 1956, we conducted a survey in 14 communities across the United States on the patterns of integration in medicine. In comparing the 14 communities, we found that in each the situation regarding integration in medicine was unique. Nevertheless, it is possible to isolate some of the key factors which make up the patterns.

The uniqueness of each community is the result of the particular way in which these key factors combine to form a particular pattern. The component parts of the pattern tend to be very similar. The main factors which we isolated were the following: (1) the presence and importance of predominantly Negro hospitals; (2) the presence of influential persons and groups actively interested in integration; (3) the existence of opportunities for Negro physicians to establish professional contacts with influential white physicians; (4) the strategy used by Negro physicians in obtaining hospital appointments; (5) the supply of well-qualified and well-trained Negro physicians; (6) the professional relationships among Negro physicians with particular emphasis on referrals; and (7) the general patterns of race relations in each community.

Of the seven factors no single factor was consistently related to the degree of integration found. This was so because in any given community the importance and significance of any of the above factors was greatly influenced by particular characteristics of the other factors in that community.

Implications of the Detroit experience

In Detroit the developments regarding integration in medicine demonstrate the significance of community awareness of the problem, professional contacts between white and Negro physicians, the interest of influential persons in integration, and action by Negro physicians in bringing about a higher degree of integration in medical facilities.

The relative attractiveness and promise of Detroit for Negro physicians was reflected in the fairly rapid increase in the number of Negro physicians since 1946: The 160 Negro physicians in 1956 represented an increase of 21.2 percent. Of this number 52.6 percent were under 50 years of age. Only in Gary, Los Angeles, and Indianapolis was a higher percentage of physicians under 50 years of age. In regard to training, Detroit with 17 board-certified Negro physicians was tied with Philadelphia for fourth place among the 14 communities we studied.

Community awareness

The previous papers have already clearly indicated a high degree of community awareness in Detroit which was focused on the problem of integration in medicine, as demonstrated in the Medical and Hospital Study Committee and the followup committee. Thus, Detroit provides an excellent example of the effectiveness of this approach.

Contacts between white and Negro physicians

The contacts established between white and Negro physicians were among the most important aids to achieving staff appointments at predominantly white hospitals in Detroit. A study of the 25 Negro physicians having such appointments indicated that 15—or 60 percent—had either attended the 2 medical schools in the Detroit area or had spent their internships and residency periods in predominantly white hospitals in Detroit. At these hospitals, they established professional relationships with white physicians which were directly responsible for their appointments to the hospital staffs.

In other cases, professional contacts established in governmental and predominantly Negro hospitals led to affiliations at predominantly white voluntary hospitals. For example, one Negro physician was helped in securing affiliation at a white hospital by staff members of this hospital with whom he had worked at the Veterans' Administration hospital. In another case, close professional relationships between the staffs of a white and a Negro hospital led to the appointments of at least three Negro physicians to the staff of the white hospital. In this instance, the superintendents and medical directors of the two hospitals were close personal friends; some of the key men at the white hospital also served on the staff of the Negro hospital; the chief pathologist of the white hospital conducted most of the meetings for the staff of the Negro hospital; and furthermore, the Negro hospital often used the laboratory of the white hospital.

In another case, a Negro physician was able to get a desired affiliation with a predominantly white hospital as the result of working with an influential staff member of this hospital at the Detroit Receiving Hospital. Still another Negro physician desiring affiliation with a specific hospital deliberately accepted an appointment at a clinic because this clinic was also serviced by important physicians from the hospital with which he desired affiliation. This technique proved successful, and after 2 years the Negro physician was able to get the appointment he wanted.

There was also a number of instances in Detroit where affiliations were secured because a Negro physician had studied or worked under white physicians of high prestige in other communities. We also found instances where Negro physicians on a staff were instrumental in getting other Negro physicians appointed.

In general, we found in Detroit that the majority of appointments to hospital staffs required that somebody on the staff be actively interested in pushing the application. A white hospital administrator made this point:

In every case where a Negro has been accepted he has been screened very carefully, and there was always somebody on the staff who had personal knowledge of the individual concerned and would speak up for him. It would be very difficult for a Negro to be put on the staff if he had not had previous contact with the white physicians already on the staff.

Interest of influential persons

In view of the prevalence of professional contacts between Negro and white physicians, there were comparatively few white physicians or administrators who appeared to be especially active in promoting integration. We encountered, however, two instances where integration in specific hospitals was clearly the result of the interest of key persons on the staffs.

In one case, the hospital was a very large one. Negro physicians on the staff pointed out that their appointments were directly due to the interest taken in their cases by the administrator. This particular person had been interested in integration for many years, but he felt that it should be encouraged by persuasion and education, rather than by determination of policy on his part. Consequently, his effect on integration in hospital appointments developed only slowly and required the operation of some of the other forces that have been discussed.

The other case concerned a medium-size, predominantly white hospital. A number of interviewees stated that the integration in staff appointments was the direct result of the personal interest in integration taken by the chief of staff of this hospital. He initiated the recruitment of qualified Negro specialists and insisted that they be given staff appointments. In this he also had the support of several of the department heads and thus was able to overcome the initial resistance of many white staff members.

Action by Negro physicians

The actions taken by Negro physicians in Detroit in order to achieve integration were an extremely important component of the Detroit experience.

Negro hospitals

The presence and the relative importance of Negro hospitals in a community are significant in two ways: they indicate the degree of integration in the community and they influence the integration process.

Predominantly Negro hospitals were absent in the six communities which had the highest degree of integration as measured by our index of the percentage of Negro physicians having appointments at predominantly white hospitals. These communities were: Gary, New York, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, Indianapolis, and Boston. Detroit, where Negro hospitals were relatively unimportant, was in seventh place, and the communities with important Negro hospitals followed.

Our data indicate that the presence of Negro hospitals influences the process of integration in two ways.

First, that Negro hospitals can provide a focal point for the self-segregation of Negroes. Such a hospital provides a place where Negro doctors can hospitalize their patients and thus reduces the doctors' needs to become affiliated with predominantly white hospitals. Furthermore, a predominantly Negro hospital provides a physical facility where Negro physicians meet, and this, in turn, can easily lead to the formation of a strong Negro ingroup, which may even resist integration.

Second, the presence of Negro hospitals reduces the pressure on white physicians and hospital administrators to admit Negroes to staff positions at predominantly white hospitals. The absence of Negro hospitals, on the other hand, puts strong pressure on whites to make some provision for the needs of Negro physicians and patients.

At the time of study in 1956 Detroit had three predominantly Negro hospitals which were approved by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals. These three hospitals had a total of 324 beds. In the total situation of medical services for the Negro community and hospital affiliations for Negro physicians, the three Negro hospitals were not significant either in the actual services they provided or in their influence on the actions of the Negro community. This is illustrated by the fact that an attempt to enlarge one hospital and make it a focal point for Negro physicians failed because of the lack of community support. There was no indication that the three Negro hospitals influenced integration in other Detroit hospitals either positively or negatively.

REPORT OF PANEL ON MENTAL RETARDATION

The panel created by President Kennedy to study the problem of mental retardation has published its report, "A Proposed Program for National Action To Combat Mental Retardation." The report defines mental retardation as "a group of complex phenomena stemming from many different causes, but one key common characteristic found in all cases is inadequately developed intelligence." Except in the very young, mental retardation can be distinguished from mental illness by the fact that it is usually present at birth or begins in childhood, whereas mental illness usually occurs after there has been normal development.

Severe mental retardation is frequently associated with organic defects and is usually fairly evenly distributed throughout the population regardless of socioeconomic status. On the other hand, mild mental retardation which constitutes the bulk of the cases can seldom, with our present biomedical tech-

niques, be associated with specific organic defects and cases are heavily concentrated in low socioeconomic income groups.

Some of the measures needed to combat mental retardation cited by the panel are: (1) more research regarding the causes of retardation and in methods of care, rehabilitation, and the learning process of the retarded; (2) better preventive health measures including strengthened maternal and child health programs, protection from known hazards in pregnancy such as radiation and drugs, and extended diagnostic and screening services; (3) educational and vocational programs for both children and adults geared to the needs of the retarded; (4) more comprehensive and improved clinical and social services; (5) development of a wide range of local community facilities for care; (6) a new enlightened legal as well as social concept of mental retardation; (7) intensified recruitment of professional personnel in all fields of science and service with provision of opportunities for them to acquire firsthand knowledge about mental retardation and the creation of a Domestic Peace Corps to stimulate voluntary service; (8) programs of education and information to increase public awareness of the problem of retardation.

The report is available from: Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.; 65 cents.

Mr. JAVITS. I call attention to the very serious and most distressing situation which exists under the Hill-Burton Act, which, by the terms of the legislation itself, allows separate but equal facilities for whites and Negroes in hospitals as accommodating the requirements of the Hill-Burton Act. This act gives the Federal Government a very important share in the construction of new hospitals and presents a situation which urgently requires legislative attention. It is literally shameful that in this day and age, after the Supreme Court decision of Brown against the Board of Education in 1954, we still have imbedded in the Hill-Burton Act—and, incidentally, in the Morrill Act with respect to land-grant colleges—the separate but equal doctrine which has been struck down by the Supreme Court, and which has caused the whole structure of policy negating the idea that that represents the American way, which it definitely does not.

These articles show how urgently legislative attention is required. I would say that one of the greatest challenges faced by the Congress is whether it can exorcise this completely obsolescent and very damaging and harmful provision of law, or whether it must sit with its hands folded and allow a provision of law with which such a great majority of the country disagrees, and which the U.S. Supreme Court struck down as being contrary to our beliefs. The question is whether that provision must remain imbedded in the law because we do not have the necessary procedures or a way of manifesting our will to change it. I shall do everything I can to bring about such change. It is a real challenge to the Congress, and one of those challenges which will determine how the Congress stands in the eyes of the country. If we cannot cope with anything as elementary as that problem, it seems to me the country must take a very dim view of our capacity for running the country's business.

SIXTH ANNUAL OBSERVANCE OF LAW DAY, USA

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, today, May 1, marks the 6th annual observance of Law Day, USA. Observance of this day, inaugurated by the American Bar Association in 1958, and now designated by Presidential proclamation, gives us Americans an excellent opportunity to reaffirm our devotion to and respect for the great heritage of American law.

Embodied in our Constitution we find the basic tenet that we are a government of laws and not of men. Article V of the Bill of Rights assures each person that the Federal Government shall not deprive him of life, liberty or property without due process of law. The 14th amendment provides that the State government shall respect this same rule. Through the consistent and continuous application of this principle we assure the freedom and equality of every individual.

Due process of law is maintained and protected through our courts. These bodies interpret our legal ideals and maintain our traditional concepts of justice through the impartial application of these principles. While our rules of law and means for enforcing them are not perfect, they allow more personal freedom than any other system known to man.

Many people have been attracted to the shores of this Nation, knowing that in America they need not fear discrimination and tyranny. These immigrants have recognized and appreciated the climate of freedom and security which the Anglo-American tradition of law has been able to offer.

The occasion that we Americans are commemorating today is in sharp contrast to the observances presently going on in Communist nations. We reserve this day as a reminder of the many freedoms we enjoy as Americans, freedoms which are constantly protected by our body of laws. The Communists use this day for a raw display of power which serves to intimidate their people and to make them aware that the only rules guiding their government are rules of physical power, administered by men outside of a framework of law. There is no room in such a system for individual freedom and expression.

We must remind ourselves and the rest of the world that the strength of our system is based on far more than overt displays of physical force. It is our belief in the protection of human rights, rights which the Communists refuse to recognize, which can best express the idea that we seek to make peace and prosperity, with freedom, a living reality throughout the world.

To survive and to fulfill its purpose, our code of law and the Nation which it sustains need the support and dedication of the people whom they serve. Law Day provides us with an appropriate opportunity to reflect on the importance of law in the American way of life.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, today, as on every May 1st since 1958, the Nation is celebrating Law Day. It is altogether fitting that we should pause for a moment in this age of rockets and missiles, to give recognition to our system of law which is so basic to peace and order in our own society as well as in the world at large.

The purpose of Law Day is to help us to become more aware of the significance of the rule of law in the preservation of freedom and the maintenance of peace. Bar associations, civic groups, and private and public organizations across the length and breadth of the Nation will hold ceremonies today directed at fostering an abiding respect for law and providing an occasion for the American people to rededicate themselves to freedom.

Our observance will serve to focus attention on the rule of law where the rights of people are governed by established rules, where the essential interests of individuals are guaranteed through limitations on the authority of the state, and where disputes are decided by impartial courts. It will help to demonstrate to the world the meaning of reliance on the rule of law.

In his proclamation of January 28, requesting our people to observe today as Law Day and to participate in ceremonies suitably signalizing its significance, President Kennedy stated:

> In a time when all men are properly concerned lest nations, forgetting law, reason, and moral existence, turn to mutual destruction, we have all the more need to work for a day when law may govern nations as it does men within nations; when systemized reason may bring us a confident future; when moral development of the human race may assure us a peaceful and law-abiding world.

It is in this spirit and with this hope that we celebrate Law Day today, knowing how essential law has been to the preservation of our own freedom and believing that the greatest promise for the consummation of our expectations of peace and tranquillity for the future lies in the development of a system of law among nations.

"ANATOMY OF DECISION"—FICTIONIZED STUDY OF EXECUTIVE DECISION PROCESS IN AN INTERNATIONAL SECURITY CRISIS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, 3 months ago on February 1, 1963, a written study was filed at the Air University at Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala., that is of specific interest with relation to the international Haitian-Dominican crisis of the past few days.

It was a fictionized study of the executive decision process in an international security crisis entitled "Anatomy of Decision." I think it is interesting reading on the interplay between the White House, the Department of State, and the Department of Defense on the making of vital decisions in time of crisis.

It is a unique piece of writing, for while it is fiction, it is documented fiction with some 225 citations from some 121 publications. Yet I think its achievement of sustained interest gives it the potentiality of an excellent 3-act play.

Because of the interest that I feel that Members of this body would have in

reading it and because of the potential interest that students of government and international and military affairs might have in it, I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANATOMY OF DECISION—A FICTIONIZED STUDY OF THE EXECUTIVE DECISION PROCESS IN AN INTERNATIONAL SECURITY CRISIS

(Prepared by William C. Lewis, Jr., brigadier general, U.S. Air Force Reserve, for completion of vol. II of course 4, War College Extension Course, Air University, February 1, 1963)

PART 1. DETECTION

Chapter I. Discovery

It had been a raw, bone-chilling day so typical of Washington in mid-March. The days were getting longer but that was not much consolation from the mixed weather pattern of snow, sleet, and rain—and those reckless impatient drivers, who literally panicked at the drop of the first snowflake—making the drive home even to nearby Georgetown a nightmare.

Scott Davidson sat by the warming fireside leisurely enjoying his nightly predinner martini with his attractive wife Martha, who had a knack for relaxing him with intelligent conversation about matters other than intelligence—Central Intelligence (14:57), that is. As his right hand stroked the soft hair of the head and back of "Cappy," the English setter, sitting by his chair, he gave a gentle sigh of relief with this fleeting peace of mind.

Central Intelligence Agency

For nearly 3 years things had not been going well for the CIA (91:31). Hindsight on the Quahog Bay invasion failure had cast such a shadow on the Agency for a year that his predecessor as Director had resigned in bitterness (5:7). Faulty intelligence had been a major defeat in the Abuc misadventure (94:68). Scott himself had been one of the critics pushing for the resignation—and when it came the President in a "put up or shut up" manner challenged him to accept the appointment as the CIA Director.

He had no choice but to accept—and now 2 years later he thought he knew how the man he had criticized felt. While he had given the CIA a thorough overhauling, his record was no better on the surface than that of his predecessor. The seemingly dramatic victory in the Abuc missile threat crisis had launched his administration with a great flush of success.

Yet, he and his Agency had not looked nearly as good as Florida's U.S. Senator Cutting, who had been so right so far in advance of the CIA on the Russian buildup in Abuc. Cutting had gambled on the reports of the Abuc refugees and had made a blistering attack on the administration (61:44). The CIA was more skeptical because it had been more cautious—and Cutting had emerged smelling like a rose in public opinion.

And in the 2 years that followed, it seemed as though the first flush of success on the Abuc crisis had actually served as a contrast to make the CIA look worse and worse. When the Ollijurts had been deposed in the Dominican Republic, the Joint Chiefs of Staff had warned of the danger of a Communist takeover. But the CIA had sided with the State Department in urging a hands off policy other than steaming up some naval vessels in the adjacent seas.

Intelligence gathered by the CIA had clearly indicated that the revolution had been led by antidictator rebels rather than by Communists. That intelligence was accurate. But now it did not look so to the American public.

For the vacuum of our hands off policy had been quickly filled by Russia in her exploitation of the fierce nationalism-neutralism feeling of the successful Dominican rebels. Economic and technical assistance was poured into the Dominican Republic by Russia and through such assistance imperceptibly a Russian orientation set in.

On top of this, the Russian representatives and technicians inspired the Dominican rebels to pursue their latent national aspiration to take over neighboring Haiti. And they had done it within 2 years after deposing the Ollijurts—not by invasion or military action, but rather by infiltration and subversion, which they had quickly learned from the Russian representatives and technicians.

New Carribbea

The final act was supposedly a plebiscite of Haiti and the Dominican Republic that voted for a merger of the two countries into the new nation of Carribbea—more accurately, Communist Carribbea. Intelligence gathered by the CIA revealed that it was a rigged plebiscite in which the great majority of anti-Communists and those Haitians opposed to the merger were not permitted to vote. But the United States had been unable to do anything about it because of the doctrine of respect for self-determination and because of the fierce sensitivity of Latin American countries to outside intervention.

Many refugees from Haiti and the Dominican Republic—from the new Carribbea—had gone to Florida and New York—and several articulate ones to Senator Cutting with grave stories of a Russian buildup in new Carribbea. Scott Davidson so often in these days had felt like saying, "This is where I came in" (63:A–15).

No; the days had been long and hard. But this end of a hard, long and cold day was peacefully pleasant with comforting Martha, loyal "Cappy," the glowing fireplace and the martini. Martha had stopped talking for some 5 minutes as she had sensed Scott's retrospective mood.

The President Calls

But the quiet was not to last long as it was pierced by the shrill ring of the telephone on the bookshelf back of Scott's lounge chair. A reluctant "Davidson speaking" was answered with "The President wishes to speak with you" and quickly followed by the irritated and troubled voice of the President.

"Scott, have you heard about the show that Cutting and Hartley put on in the Senate late this afternoon?"

"No, but they do it so often these days that they're outpacing the Ed and Chesley show—and they say the same thing over and over."

"Well, this time it isn't the same thing. My Senate liaison man was in the gallery and he is of the opinion that it is serious. He said that Cutting not only produced statements of Dominican refugees that the Russians are transforming new Carribbea into a huge bunker (30:42a) (108:28, 30) but also produced what they claim are pictures of Russian missiles, planes, submarines and ships in new Carribbea—and he told me that the pictures are going to be shown on the 8 o'clock 'Today' TV program in the morning with Cutting and Hartley appearing on that program. We checked with NBC and they confirmed this. I also asked Cutting for copies of the pictures—and he told me that he was sending them over."

Straightening up in his lounge chair, Davidson said, "But, as you know, Mr. President, the Defense Intelligence Board has taken the position that the Russians would never put offensive missiles in Carribbea because they would be too exposed (46:4). I'll be right over."

"No need for that Scott, right now. I'm not concerned about Cutting because he is a meticulous man. But I am concerned about Hartley. You'll remember he called for our blasting Abuc out of the Caribbean and he's up for reelection this year and this is a natural for him. Ordinarily he wouldn't be taken seriously, but this time the Cutting pictures could make a difference, and public opinion on new Carribbea seems to be ripe for political exploitation by Hartley.

"What can I do, Mr. President?" Scott said a little wearily.

"Get your CIA boys together with General Mack of the Defense Intelligence Agency (22:197) in the Pentagon. I'll have the Cutting pictures sent over to General Mack's office. I'll have Mack notified to set the conference up in his office for 9 o'clock tonight and to have his people there to meet with you and your people. But be sure to have your dinner because you'll have a full night. I want you and Mack to have a full intelligence report on the Russian buildup in Carribbea together with an analysis and evaluation of the Cutting pictures on my desk at the White House at 6:30 tomorrow morning. That will give me time to prepare comment and reply to whatever Cutting and Hartley say on the 'Today' show."

Chapter II. Investigation

With a "Will do, Mr. President," by Scott the conversation terminated. Scott then called his CIA deputy and gave instructions for the conference in General Mack's office.

Shortly thereafter upon call from the White House, Lt. Gen. Carroll Mack, U.S. Army Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency (21:51) (22:197), in turn called the Army Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence (25:140, 148), the ACNO Director of Naval Intelligence (28:156, 160) and the Air Force Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence (24:181, 189) and requested their attendance at the conference at 9 o'clock that night. He also called the Director of Intelligence and Research of the State Department (121:5) inviting him to attend the conference.

Intelligence Conference

At 9 o'clock sharp in room 3E258 (27:C–9) in the Pentagon, the conference was called to order by General Mack, who then turned the chairmanship of the conference over to Scott Davidson. By that time several sets of prints of the Cutting pictures had been made. They were passed around to the attendants at the conference. In addition to these prints, the White House had obtained copies late that afternoon from the Senate official reporters of the remarks made by Senators Cutting and Hartley a few hours before in the Senate.

Davidson outlined the situation summing up with the requirement of the President that the group make a thorough but succinct evaluation and analysis of the status of any Russian military buildup in Caribbea—and specifically, evaluation of the Cutting pictures—to be placed on his desk in a little more than 12 hours later at 6:30 the next morning. "In short," he said, "gentlemen, our time is short and our mission is awesome. Yet, we have to a great extent already made our personal evaluations. The only new factor at this point is the Cutting pictures. Are they genuine? Do they make a significant difference?"

The group worked throughout the night (61:50) calling in photographic intelligence experts of their staffs and the latest intelligence evaluations of new Carribbea and its Russian relations. Comparisons and arguments were made. The Air Force and the Navy contended that the Cutting pictures, even if authentic, did not change their evaluations which had been that a very threatening Russian military buildup had been underway for some time and that the Cutting pictures only corroborated those evaluations.

The prior evaluations of the Army and the CIA had been that admittedly Russian military equipment had been sent into Carribbea but that it was in the nature of military

assistance for internal security rather than for external action and was of defensive rather that offensive character and thus constituted no serious threat. The State Department Director of Intelligence and Research sided with the evaluation that there was no serious threat.

Evaluation

At 2:30 the combined photographic intelligence experts reported to the group that they were of the unanimous opinion that the Cutting pictures were: (1) authentic and (2) disclosed evidence that was indicative, but not conclusive, that the character and numbers of missiles, IL–28 jet bombers (8:A1) (17:A1), submarines and ships had extensive external potentials.

After an hour of close questioning and discussion, the Army, the CIA, and the State Department representatives concluded that there was indication of a significant change. At that point, two staff members were directed to draft a report. That draft was completed in an hour and a half and then presented to the group. A few changes were made and the final draft was approved by the group, as an informal agent of the U.S. Intelligence Board (5:7) (60:6), and signed by Scott Davidson as head of the CIA and General Mack as Director of Defense Intelligence Agency with noted concurrence by the State Department Director of Intelligence.

The group dispersed to return to their offices or homes for short naps. At 5:30 a.m., Scott Davidson called Jack Brandt, the Special Adviser to the President on National Security Affairs, out of bed with a cryptic, "We've finished the report the President wants. Meet me at the White House as soon as you can get there." At 6 Davidson handed the report to Brandt—and at 6:30 Brandt knocked on the small library room door of the President and entered with the report (2:18).

The President sat down at the small desk and began to read the four-page report, first with a hurried scanning prompted by impatience to get the findings, and then second and third slow readings as if he were digesting the facts and observations supporting the findings—findings that the Cutting pictures were authentic and significant, but at this point only strongly indicative rather than conclusive. He was most impressed with the changed positions of the Army, CIA, and State.

Call of National Security Council

Looking very tired at the very start of the day, he glanced upward and said, "Jack, call the members of the National Security Council (109:31) and tell them to be here for a meeting at 9 this morning. This should be a good test of their ability to bridge the gap between civilian policymakers and military strategists (74:49) for a judicious coordination of our political and military strength—the elements of national policy (74:56). On your way have my breakfast sent in."

At 8 he watched Cutting and Hartley on television. Surprisingly their discussion lacked the dramatic punch he had anticipated. It was conducted on such a restrained key as almost to be dull. Hartley was remarkably restrained. Perhaps it was because the precise and meticulous Cutting dominated the discussion and obviously strained for an unemotional, matter-of-fact tone. Perhaps it was because, at the outset, the obviously proadministration NBC moderator-commentator had cuttingly reminded Hartley of the effective manner in which the President had met the Abuc threat without invasion and bombing.

And perhaps it was because to the untrained eyes of the viewing public the true meaning of the pictures did not come through. Whatever it was, the President was confident that it would not significantly stir the public any further from its already indicated concern about Carribbea.

Yet, the President was concerned because he knew the Russian Embassy was carefully watching the telecast and he could not know what impact the Cutting pictures had on the Russian experts. Because of this and his appraisal of the lack of appeal of the telecast to the public, he called his press secretary at the end of the program and said, "Joe, the telecast didn't hurt enough to require a reply. I want to play it down in order to avoid tipping our hand in any manner to the Russians. So tell the press that I have no comment on the matter."

Chapter III. National Security Council

At 9 sharp the members of the National Security Council (76:56, 57) (108:30) entered the office of the President—Vice President Jim Landon, Secretary of State Arthur Burgess, Secretary of Defense Carter Topping and Emergency Planning Director Tom Kelly. Others present were the secretariat officials Jack Brandt, Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs (109:35), his deputy Carl Smith, and the Executive Secretary Brinkley Walter (109:36)—and Scott Davidson.

"I assume you saw Cutting and Hartley on the NBC telecast at 8," was his manner of opening the meeting. Vice President Landon responded first with "Yes, that damn Hartley has more guts than brains—but he can hurt us at the next election."

Open With CIA Briefing

"We're not here to discuss politics," the President observed acidly, "and we might as well get to the point immediately. Scott (109:40) read the report and then we'll get down to brass tacks and make minimum decisions."

When Scott finished reading the report, the President turned to Defense Secretary Topping (26:121, 128) and said, "Intelligence has thus performed its warning role (48:8) Carter, what's your reaction? Are we in real trouble? Are we in a 'falling domino' position as Eisenhower spoke of on Indochina in 1954? (13:261) I mean military and physical danger—aside from the psychological factor and international prestige."

Secretary of Defense

Topping slowly adjusted his glasses, leaned back in his chair, rubbed his nose and stared upward as though addressing the ceiling instead of the President. No offense was taken by the President as he had become accustomed to this gesture—and had even good naturedly told Topping that sometimes he didn't know whether he was talking to a higher Authority or seeking Divine Guidance for his answer.

In measured words, the Defense Secretary said, "I don't know. I thought the Russians after their quick backdown on Abuc would not push so hard again so soon. But I can't forget how accurate Cutting was on the Russian buildup in Abuc. I never did believe that he got all his information from refugees but strongly suspected much of it came directly from sources inside the Pentagon. Whatever the sources, he was right and made us look bad—and I am not about to discount him again on these pictures."

Secretary of State

Turning to Secretary of State Burgess (29:63, 73), the President said, "How about you, Art? Do you think Khrushchev is preparing for two steps forward after his one step backward on Abuc?"

"I doubt it, Mr. President," Burgess quickly replied. "I think Khrushchev learned his lesson in the Abuc crisis on American credibility that our patience and willingness to go more than half way for negotiated peace is not unlimited and that we will fight when we are convinced we are really threatened. But I'd rather get the thinking of my Kremlinologists (7:17) before giving you a firm opinion."

Emergency Planning Director

Nodding at Emergency Director Kelly, the President said, "It's your turn, Tom. What are your thoughts?"

With his typical disarming candor, Kelly raised his hands outward and sighed, "I'm not an expert on this and you know it, Mr. President. My job is to mobilize the resources to back up the military and diplomatic decisions (32a:59). All I'll say is that I wouldn't put a wooden nickel on that loudmouth Hartley. He tries to yell us into a shooting war yet he violently opposes giving us a cent for civil defense and screams about the waste of taxpayers' money on stockpiling."

CIA Director

The irony of Kelly's remarks about Senator Hartley was reflected in the sardonic smile of the President as he wheeled his chair around to face Scott Davidson, who had been seated to his immediate right for reading the report. "And you, Scott?" he questioned.

"Well, this is getting close to policy decision, Mr. President, and you know the CIA is forbidden from policy formulation. I'm ever mindful of the gap (116:26) or line drawn between intelligence and policy (33:17)."

"Come now, Scott, no one thinks you would try to tell me what to do."

"No, of course not, but you never know when that woman on the Senate Armed Services Committee will ask me when I am before the committee whether I ever made policy decisions—and I want to be able to remain snow white pure so that I can say I only collect and evaluate intelligence and never recommend decisions (15:53, 54, 83). They won't be able to ignore her seniority and keep her off the Subcommittee on the CIA forever."

Visibly irritated, the President glared, "Forget about her—there is such a thing as Executive privilege, you know, that even that relentless woman can't pierce. What do you really think?"

"Frankly, I'm concerned, Mr. President. Perhaps it's because I can't forget that Cutting looked so good so far in advance on the Abuc missile crisis. The photographic intelligence analysts say the Cutting pictures are not proof positive but they hedge and say that they should not be discounted or underrated. They resort to the escape clause distinction between the words 'indicative' and 'conclusive'."

The Vice President

At this point, Vice President Landon, who had remained uncomfortably silent since the President had cut him off with the no politics remark, broke in with "I think that's the nub of our problem here. The Cutting pictures are indicative enough—with his past record of being so right—that we can't discount them. Yet, this is too serious and risky business to accept them as gospel truth and act prematurely and precipitously on them. I suggest that we try to corroborate them before we make any decision on how great the threat is and on what we decide to do."

"You've got a point, Jim," the President admitted, "We've got to double check."

With soft sarcasm, Jim Landon replied, "Oh, that's something I learned from politics—especially that time when I was elected to the Senate by a thin 100 votes."

"Touché, Jim. I had a close one myself. But how do we doublecheck without tipping our hand to the Russians? The only thing about the Senate show and the telecast this morning that worried me was the disclosure of the Cutting pictures."

Defense Boss Topping moved forward to the edge of his chair and volunteered, "I

don't think that will be too difficult, Mr. President. We already have the Navy-Marine amphibious exercise going on in the Caribbean (19:6) and specifically in the Windward Passage and Mona Passage—maneuvers that were scheduled and announced several weeks ago. We could have some carrier-based aircraft on those maneuvers accidentally fly off course and do photographic reconnaissance on the western half of Carribbea perhaps without arousing suspicion. To cover the eastern half we could have the Air Force from Ramey Air Force Base make flyovers.

"But that would bring diplomatic repercussions and protests from Carribbea," objected diplomat boss Burgess, "and we run the risk of Carribbea protesting to the OAS, and perhaps the U.N. It could damage our image in Latin America.

"To hell with our image in Latin America," exploded the "Veep," "the greatest impairment we had there was from our timidity on the Quahog Bay invasion fiasco. They'll respect us a damn sight more if we do stand up (68:A–14) as we finally did on the Abuc missile issue before backsliding on the submarine bases there. Sure, they may gripe and criticize us—but only like a younger brother scolds his older and bigger brother."

With obviously hurt feelings, Burgess met this explosion with a muted, "I'm a little tired of having the charge of timidity hurled at the State Department—we have just as much courage as anyone else. I'm only trying to think ahead. Besides, if Carribbea should protest to the OAS, it might give the Russians a cue to protest to the U.N. and thus set up a doubleheader program for stalling. That could hamper you, couldn't it Carter?"

Defense Secretary Topping drawled out a slow, "Yes," and then continued, "But since you are thinking about my department, Art, I'll do a little thinking about yours—you know, under the law we do have to integrate military policy and foreign policy. I suggest that to take the focus off of Caribbea we also have carrier-based planes in the maneuvers make the mistake of flying off course and over Jamaica—and the Air Force planes also fly over the northern Leeward Islands.

"Then if they all protest it will tend to confuse the protests of Carribbea and Russia—or if Jamaica and the Leeward Islands don't protest, Carribbea and Russian protests will be discounted to that extent as far as Latin American countries and the OAS are concerned."

Chapter IV. Initial Presidential decisions and staff implementation

At that point, the President broke in, "I agree with Jim that we immediately doublecheck the Cutting pictures. While I'm not so sure, Carter, that pincer aerial reconnaissance you suggest can be pulled off without incident, I think your plan is sound and I want it carried out today."

President's First Decisions

Turning to his Special Adviser on National Security Affairs, he said, "Jack, jot down these decisions from this meeting.

"First, I want the Secretary of Defense upon leaving this meeting to start the ball rolling on the aerial photo reconnaissance over Carribbea—such surveillance would give me hours of warning, time enough to head off any attack (18:47).

"Second, the Director of Defense Intelligence Agency will have a thorough analysis and evaluation made of photographs taken on these flyovers. Then he shall give a briefing to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Director of the CIA, and the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

"Third, that group shall then give its appraisal of the situation in a report—and make it short.

"Fourth, the Secretary of State shall hold a briefing conference with the Under Secretary of State, the State Department Director of Intelligence, the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, and the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs—in anticipation of diplomatic protests against the flyovers. He shall direct the Kremlinologists (7:17) and the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Politico-Military Affairs to prepare a 'think' memorandum for me as to their educated guesses on what Khrushchev and his Caribbean stooges may do about the flyovers.

"Fifth, the composition of the National Security Council is too limited for pooling the best brains on this threat. While I want the NSC to continue as a body for very candid discussion and debate (31:64), I want to make sure that it is more a planning agency than a bargaining forum (44:145). So I'm setting up an Executive Committee of the National Security Council (40:4). In addition to myself, it will be composed of the regular members of the NSC except the Emergency Planning Director, you as my Special Adviser on National Security Affairs, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General (40:4), the Under Secretary of State, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the CIA Director, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs and the Ambassador to the United Nations (38:A1) (101:A21). Notify them immediately. The Executive Committee, in effect my 'War Council' will take over as the agent of the NSC until we have made our final decisions. It will take the place of both the old Operations Coordinating Board (47:71, 72) (42:56, 57) (82:64) (109:36) that was abolished in 1961 (81:649) (105:24) and the NSC Planning Board (43:64) (85:20) (109:37), which has been dormant in my administration as contrasted to the Eisenhower administration."

He then rose from his desk with a "That wraps it up. The Executive Committee will meet as soon as we get the evaluations from the flyovers. Good hunting, Carter—and brace yourself, Art, for the verbal blasts from Khrushchev and his Carribbea stooge. Thank you for coming."

Defense Implementation

Upon return to his office in the Pentagon, Carter Topping summoned to his office Deputy Secretary of Defense Gilbert Roswell (26:121, 129), Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Tigh Maxwell (26:125, 137), Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency General Mack, Assistant Secretary for Manpower Paul Norman (26:124, 133), and Assistant Secretary for Installations and Logistics Robinson Roderick (26:123, 131) and relayed the instructions of the President.

"Tigh, get the wheels turning immediately on aerial photo reconnaissance flights over Carribbea by Navy F84 Crusaders, Air Force RF–101 Voodoos, and SAC U–2's (106:E5). General Mack, give Tigh a set of the Cutting pictures, for I want special attention by the flyovers to those spots the Cutting pictures allegedly cover. I want a thorough analysis, evaluation, and report within 36 hours.

"We didn't get to any discussion of possible action this morning but the broad alternatives are fairly clear now ranging from doing nothing more than a strong diplomatic protest to full-scale invasion of Carribbea—with the possible intermediary thresholds of air and sea blockade or selective pinpoint bombing. We've got to be ready for anything and plan for the worst and hope for the best. Personally I think the Cutting pictures will hold up.

"So, Tigh, I want the JSC to review all war gaming to date and direct intensive war game planning on all reasonably foreseeable potentials (108:30) in this situation. I want Operation X (invasion of Carribbea if ordered) updated (61:50). Get going on this immediately—together with the drafting of such plans and orders as are necessary for movements of personnel and equipment.

"Robby, get your boys working on a report on the logistics capabilities and the major logistics problems arising from the situation. And Paul, I'll want a thorough manpower appraisal (62:96)—especially our Reserve callup capability with specific attention to the airlift capability of the troop carrier wings of the Air Force Reserve.

"Gil, we've got precious little time if the Cutting pictures do hold up. It's the old story of wanting something yesterday on a time target. But I want all of this I have requested as soon as possible because I'm sure the Executive Committee of the National Security Council will be called into session by the President within a couple of days—and then the discussion on decisions to be made by the President will start. I want as much as you can get me by that time. So you've got the job of riding herd on Tigh, General Mack, Robby, and Paul, and putting together their reports in an overall summary for me. That's it—now get going, fellows."

State Implementation

At the same time, wheels had started turning in the State Department. State Secretary Art Burgess called Under Secretary Jim Batt (29:63, 73) to his office and said, "Jim, I've just come from a NSC meeting at the White House and it looks as though we may be on the brink of the moment of truth with Khrushchev for the Communist buildup in Carribbea may be greater than we have calculated. I want to get committees started considering proposals ranging from invasion to a diplomatic approach to Russia (56:A31). I want you to set up a luncheon conference for me today. Besides yourself have the Under Secretary for Political Affairs (29:63, 74), the Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs (29:64, 78) and the Director of Intelligence and Research (29:63, 75) (80:975) there to brief me on the Carribbea situation.

"Also get the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Politico-Military Affairs (29:63, 75) (79:8) together with our Kremlinologists this afternoon for a brainpicking session among themselves on anticipating the Kremlin's mental processes and reaction to our making flyovers on Carribbea—and if necessary, alternative actions ranging from a strong diplomatic note protesting any Communist military buildup in Carribbea to full scale invasion of Carribbea. Tell them I want a 'think' memorandum from them by noon tomorrow. They'll probably have to work all night."

Thus, the spadework started at Defense and State. It continued around the clock the rest of that day and for all of the next day. For the time being the indians were taking over and the chiefs were the "waiters"—for policy, strategic and tactical decisions had to wait for analysis, appraisal and anticipatory evaluation.

Enemy Threat Confirmed

This was a time of a relative behind-the-scenes silence—a silence of urgency that was to be broken 2 days later by General Mack's telephone call to CIA Director Scott Davidson at an early hour of 6 a.m., with the terse words, "The new pictures have been made and fully analyzed—they back up the Cutting pictures 100 percent." (62:95)

"I'll be at your office at 8 sharp," was the reflex response of Davidson, "I'll get the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs and bring him with me. Will you see that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are there?"

"Right," Mack replied, "it shouldn't take long for the briefing for it's so clear cut. May take a little time for the group to draft an appraisal report for the President."

Four hours later his National Security Affairs Adviser, Jack Brandt, handed the group's three-page appraisal report to the President. He read it slowly at first without expression, oral or facial—put it down

on his desk and then sighed, "It's even worse than what the Cutting pictures indicated. Round up the NSC Executive Committee for a meeting here in an hour—at 11 o'clock sharp. Also have General Mack here."

PART 2. DISSECTION

Chapter V. First meeting of NSC executive committee

There was a full attendance at the meeting. The President opened it with the observation "Aerial reconnaissance photographs taken of Carribbea by our RF–101's in Florida, our B–47's at Ramey Air Force Base in Puerto Rico, our U–2's (87:E11) there and at the Guantanamo Naval Base, and the F–8U Navy planes from the Second Fleet on maneuvers in the Windward Passage, establish beyond any doubt that an offensive buildup in Carribbea has reached a highly developed stage (63:A–15). It represents a threat of very serious proportions to the United States both here at home and abroad."

Intelligence Photographic Briefing

"General Mack will now show you pictures taken during the past 2 days."

Detailed blowups of the pictures were then flashed upon a large screen and General Mack meticulously coordinated his briefing pointer and commentary in analysis of the pictures. It was a study of grim faces when the briefing terminated and the lights were turned back on. The pallor grew even heavier when CIA Director Davidson read the three-page Davidson-Mack report which had triggered the President's call of the meeting.

President Frames the Picture

Again the President took over. "As I see it, gentlemen, the beginning of the decision time starts right now—and time is of the essence (104:26) in these decisions. We have certain obvious alternatives (11:45). On one extreme end, I can make the decision to do nothing—to let matters ride along and hope that the buildup is nothing but a calculated bluff by Khrushchev in the belief that he would not start a nuclear war with attack on this country from Carribbea because if he so decided to attack he could strike us with ICBM's launched from Russia itself. I can make the decision to do nothing for fear of starting something that will eventually escalate into nuclear war.

"On the other extreme, there is the alternative of a sudden, without warning full-scale invasion of Carribbea on the hypothesis that with the military advantage of surprise, we can occupy Carribbea as a quick fait accompli before Russia can take any effective retaliatory action. But this involves the greatest risk of all-out-war—and we must guard against disaster (11:46).

"In-between alternatives are (a) carry a protest to the United Nations, or (b) blockade Carribbea until the offensive military capability is removed, or (c) make air strikes on the offensive sites (61:50).

"Which shall it be—or what shall it be—is there any course that will accomplish the objective of meeting the threat without impairing the security of our country? The floor is open for discussion and for the sake of order, we shall proceed by presidential succession seniority. That means that you are up first, Mr. 'Veep.'"

"Veep" Sizeup

In the characteristic gesture that telegraphed nervousness and concern to his close associates, Jim Landon tightened his mouth, pushed his lip up and backwards at the same time and stiffly rubbed them with the three midfingers of his right hand.

"You will recall, Mr. President," he nasally drawled, "that at the meeting 2 days ago of the NSC, I made two basic observations. The first was that we should make the flyovers immediately to double check on the Cutting pictures. The second was that we should do so regardless of the risks—that it was about time we shed our seeming timidity and took on a posture of courage—that our image in Latin America and the world had been weakened far too much by our past caution.

"We shed our timidity at first on Abuc and forced the Russian pullout of missiles and bombers. We established credibility with Khrushchev. But then we backslid as we did nothing when it was discovered that the Russians had missile submarine bases in Abuc under the guise of fishing bases (2:18) and retained Russian aircraft and military forces under the defensive facade. We lost much of the credibility we had gained (18a:35).

"I think the worst decision that we could make now would be the decision to do nothing—to take a cautious wait-and-see decision and to hope for the better. For there comes a time when we must stand. Thank God, we did stand in Abuc up to the point of the submarine bases—but that will mean nothing if we do not stand now.

"I'm not so sanguine now as to advocate that we make a full-scale invasion of Carribbea—because I want to hear what the Joint Chiefs of Staff say first. But if the choice is between do nothing and coast or invade as soon as possible, I'm for invading—because there is only one direction for coasting—and that is down hill. That's my say in a nutshell."

Showing no reaction, the President looked at Art Burgess and simply said, "Your time at bat, Art."

Secretary of State Urges Restraint

Tapping his knee with his fingers, the Secretary of State moisted his lips and said, "Well, Mr. President, I guess that I'm ingrained with the traditional diplomatic attitude that all differences should be settled by agreement at the conference table rather than by bullets on the battlefield, to use archaic war terms. In my first task to identify the crucial international problem (112:64), I must first stress peace through negotiation.

"I disagree fundamentally with the Vice President, for I think the worst thing we can do would be to invade—to be guilty of starting the warfare. It would violate our deepest traditions (19:6). I think even if we pulled it off with complete victory and without any retaliation of force from Khrushchev, we would still be the loser—for we would have lost the impeccable reputation of never having started a war—of never having been the attacker—and we would lose what remaining confidence, prestige and influence we have not only in Latin America, but throughout the entire world as well. We must maintain a decent respect for the opinions of mankind (37:5) (102:14).

"Fortunately, I don't think that we are faced with the disastrous choice of nuclear war or humiliating surrender. I think we can take action that will sober and restrain Khrushchev. That action is to lodge a complaint in the forum of world opinon, the listening post of the human race (115:71)—the United Nations—against the Russians and Carribbea—to exercise our right to bring the matter before the Security Council of the U.N. (47:A–4) and to demand that the U.N. send an inspection team into Carribbea.

"By doing this I think we would expose Khrushchev to the world—and we would win a psychological victory of significant proportions—significant in that it would bring home to the people of Latin America, as nothing else has before, the Communist threat against their own security and freedom. I think, and so do my Kremlinologists, that this would have a significantly enough psychological effect on Latin American countries as to make Khrushchev stop and pause. Our Ambassador to the U.N. shares this opinion.

"I would propose that we concurrently call for a session of the Organization of American States and push for an OAS resolution condemning the buildup and expressing solidarity in opposition to it. We must recognize that foreign policy and defense policy are directed toward the world environment (84:47). My Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs, our Ambassador to the OAS, and my Politico-Military Affairs staff have expressed confidence that we would get solid backing on this in the OAS.

"Even if these estimates should be wrong, we would still have open the alternatives for military action. But I do agree with the Vice President on one point—that I'm not irrevocably wedded to this position because I first want to hear what the Joint Chiefs of Staff—and the Secretary of Defense—have to say—particularly about what military strength we have to back up any stronger foreign relations policy than that which I have now proposed."

Defense Secretary Favors Firmness

Now it was Defense Secretary Carter Topping's turn in the line of presidential succession. He looked at the Secretary of State and directed his initial remarks to him instead of the President with "Art, have you received any protests from Carribbea or Khrushchev on the flyovers?"

"No," replied Burgess, "and frankly I'm very surprised. There hasn't been a peep from them. I think that shows that they are not trigger happy—and that we can have some hope that they are amenable to reason."

Scowling, his face flushed but the knuckles of his hand white with tenseness, the usually impeccably cool Topping, with the cutting incisiveness of an M–60 machinegun, said, "Well, I've received a complaint from them—not in words but in a missile that killed one of my boys now in a watery Windward Passage grave with his U–2 plane. They were trigger happy enough to pull the trigger on him. I received the confirmation of this just before I left the Pentagon for this meeting." (2:18) (57:A2)

Then turning to the President, Topping said, "To me, Mr. President this is more than the loss of a young, heroic Air Force major. It is a clear indication that Khrushchev and his stooges in Carribbea are acting instead of talking—that they are not going to be restrained by diplomatic words alone—that the only thing they will understand and pause about now is action on our part.

"In my opinion, taking this up in the U.N. and the OAS first before acting will not only not restrain them—but will tip our hand and will give them more time to stall and delay us—and in the meantime to accelerate their own buildup in Carribbea.

"I can tell you now that we certainly have the strength to restrain them and whip them if they choose to fight. For this time we will be fighting in an area of greatest advantage to us rather than in a place to their own advantage like Berlin, Laos, or Vietnam.

"I don't think we will have to resort to a full-scale invasion—at least not at the very beginning. I think we can take action short of that. But I do think that we will have to take some military action instead of wishful-hoping diplomacy alone in a United Nations that has amply demonstrated its difficulty in achieving quick response—or in an OAS which, with the exception of the Abuc crisis, has failed to give us solid backing.

"I think we should act first and then take the diplomatic steps—for I think the OAS will be more likely to support us after we have acted unilaterally than if we go hat in hand in advance begging their help.

"I think we have more than one choice between invasion and the U.N. We could invoke a full blockade—or a limited blockade. Or we could decide on selective, pinpoint bombing of offensive points. But I have not reached a firm conclusion in my own mind."

Treasury Secretary Sides With Diplomacy

Now it was Treasury Secretary George Dawson's turn. A direct look from the President was sufficient signal to him. "My judgment is questionable on two points, Mr. President. First, Treasury has little basis for informed judgment as compared to State and Defense. Second, as a former Under Secretary of State, we all know that I am oriented to the diplomatic approach on a matter like this. I agree with Art. I think we should exhaust our diplomatic potentials before resorting to military action—but with a warning in that diplomacy that we will resort to military action if necessary."

Attorney General Raises Moral Issue

"What's the judgment of our legal expert?" the President asked of Attorney General Ken Roberts.

"Mr. President, as a lawyer I think in terms of the legality of any action that we take—and actually that means thinking in terms of the morality of any action that we take," was Roberts' solemn response (19:6).

"The Secretary of State made a good point when he said that we should not stain the impeccable moral reputation and prestige that we have of never having started a war. I agree with him—but I don't think he is quite accurate because our country does have one stain in its record and that was the Mexican War. In my travels around the world that is the one argument thrown against me by the Commies that I have never been able to deny.

"For us to attack Carribbea—either by full-scale invasion or by limited, pinpoint bombing—without warning, would be just as immoral as the Japanese sneak attack on Pearl Harbor (87:E11). It would impair the confidence of the other nations in the world against us for a long, long time. And as a nation we would have a guilt complex for a long time. It just isn't worth the military tactical advantage of surprise.

"Whatever we do—I feel strongly that we should clearly and firmly establish in advance a legal and moral basis for our action," he concluded.

Impact of the Attorney General's words was clear from the prolonged silence among the group. That silence was not broken until the President said, "I don't think there is need for any further discussion from the rest of you present since the rest of the Executive Committee are under those who have already spoken—that is, unless any of you who have not spoken do have a point you would like to make."

Chairman of the JCS Speaks Up

At that point, Tigh Maxwell, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, stood up erectly and said, "Mr. President, as a military man I am not unmindful of the moral obligations we have to mankind and I am proud of the moral history of our country. I want to keep it as high as possible. But there is more than one way to measure morality. It is not immoral to shoot a murderer in self defense. It is not immoral to attack those who, if given more time and further opportunity, will kill all freedom and liberty in the world. The United States must demonstrate by actions as well as by words that we are militarily invincible while supremely devoted to peace." (34:25)

U.N. Ambassador Fires Back

Almost simultaneously as Tigh Maxwell sat down, Steve Adler, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, was on his feet. This was the second moment of personal difference tension in the discussion and the tremor of Adler's voice threatened an emotional explosion as he said, "Mr. President, we Americans are not the sole judges of morality—and we cannot fashion and shape the standards of morality to suit our own convenience and expediency. Nor can I agree with Defense Secretary Topping that the United Nations has amply demonstrated its difficulty in achieving quick response. I would recall your attention to the magnificently quick response that the United Nations gave when South Korea was invaded by the Communists.

"But that was accomplished only because the Russians had absented themselves at the time in a boycott they were carrying on against the United Nations," broke in Topping, "had the Russians been present they would have used their veto in the Security Council to block and stall action. Look what they did when the Hungarian uprising was brought before the U.N."

Adler then shot back with, "Well, if you decide to invade don't keep me in the dark as you did on the Quahog Bay invasion fiasco and yet look to me to defend such a policy in the U.N." (90:B11)

President Steps In

Sensing that the discussion was about to shift from an objective discussion of policies to a subjective clash of personalities, the President incisively cut in with "Gentlemen, this is no time for the luxury of polemics—or for 'gales of controversy' (67:50) as Senator Jack Henry has put it. Nor is it a time for final decisions.

"But the discussion has been constructive in its brutal frankness. And I could not have asked for greater productiveness than this session has given me. Frankly, it has resulted in steering my tentative decisions in specific directions. Other than to say I am prepared to use force, but prefer to use the threat of force first (101:A21), I am not yet ready to indicate what those directions are—simply because I will not make final decisions until I have more information and more specific evaluation."

Chapter VI. Task forces

"In order to achieve this, I am now appointing five task forces (105:24) to work from the close of this meeting continuously until I call another session of the Executive Committee. I want each task force to be prepared at all times with a succinct but thorough report of its evaluations and recommendations to me in the mission assigned to it. Those missions are clear from the titles of the task forces."

Intelligence Task Force

"Task Force No. 1 will be the Intelligence Task Force. It will be chairmaned by the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and its members will be the Director of Defense Intelligence Agency, the Director of Intelligence and Research of the State Department (121:5), and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It will be in effect the U.S. Intelligence Board (32:39) minus the AEC and military services representatives (5:7). It will report to me through Jack Brandt, my Special Adviser on National Security Affairs."

Diplomatic-Political Task Force

"Task Force No. 2 will be the Diplomatic-Political Task Force. It will be chairmaned by the Under Secretary of State with the Vice Chairmen being the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs (6:1–6) (23:23) (26:123, 132). Its membership will be divided into two teams. Team A will be the Soviet Affairs Team captained by the Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs (29:65, 78) and composed of our Ambassador to the United Nations (29:70, 88), the Department of Defense Regional Director for the Sino-Soviet Region (26:124), the State Department Director of the Office of Soviet Union Affairs (29:65, 68), and Art Burgess' 'Kremlinologists.'

"Team B will be the Western Hemisphere Affairs Team captained by the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs and composed of our Ambassador to the Organization of American States (29:561), the Department of Defense Regional Director for the Western Hemisphere Region (26:132), and the State Department Director of the Office of Caribbean and Mexican Affairs (29:64, 78).

"Task Force No. 2 will report to me through the Secretary of State."

Military Task Force

"Task Force No. 3 will be the Military Task Force. It will be chairmaned by the Deputy Secretary of Defense and the Vice Chairman will be the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and its members will be the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Logistics, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, and the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Politico-Military Affairs (79:8) (105:24). It will report to me through the Secretary of Defense."

Legal Task Force

"Task Force No. 4 will be the Legal Task Force. It will be chairmaned by the Deputy Attorney General (20:6) and its members will be the Legal Adviser of the State Department (29:63, 75) (20:6) (121:6), the General Counsel of the Department of Defense (26:125, 134), and the Special Counsel to the President (19:6). It will report to me through the Attorney General."

Information Task Force

"Task Force No. 5 will be the Information Task Force. It will be chairmaned by the Director of the U.S. Information Agency and its members will be the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs (23:25), the Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs (26:124, 133) (29:64, 76), the Special Assistant to the President for Congressional Relations, and my Press Secretary. It will report to me through the Vice President.

"I shall expect all task forces to consult, confer and cross-check with each other as may be found necessary or desirable—and I shall expect each task force to prepare a program of implementation in its own area of action once the basic decisions have been made.

"I want the Strategic Air Command put on alert 3 and all other Armed Forces on alert 4 (18:47).

"Be prepared for call at any time, gentlemen. I don't want a case of mixture of improvisation and panic as on Dienbienphu (100:35). That concludes the meeting."

One by one the group quickly filed out of the President's office with a sense of urgency to get the task forces into action. The only remark made was that of the Secretary of State that "Unless we keep our wits, we may be fighting for our lives within a week." (61:54)

Task Forces at Work

Within the hour, all five task forces (86:47) were hard at work—giving real meaning to the observation that "Defense and foreign policy are a seamless web." (44:133) No. 1 (Intelligence) started with the reports of the latest U–2 flyovers of Carribbea and then turned to consideration of intelligence which might give clues as to what might be the objective of Khrushchev and what other steps might be anticipated. Was this merely a squeeze play directed to put pressure to get us out of Berlin? Was it a further move of the Soviets to control the major narrow water passages of the world—the Skaggerak, the Dardanelles, Suez, the Malacca Straits, Panama (49:83, 92) and this time the Windward Passage and the Mona Passage?

Team A of Task Force 2 was brainpicking its Kremlinologists on the possible reaction of "Khrushchev and Company" to each of the alternative courses of action set forth by the President. It then turned to discussion of what had to be done with respect to our allies—especially those of NATO—on these possible courses of action. Should we confer with them before making decisions or

should we act unilaterally—but with advance notice and how short notice? Should we bypass the United Nations?

The other half of Task Force 2, Team B, began its discussion with the anticipated reaction of Latin American countries to each of the alternatives and quickly came to agreement that invasion or air strike would alienate these countries in varying degrees. On the other hand, there was general agreement that we should avoid the appearance of asking their permission to act for while that might please their national egos it could indicate weakness and timidity in our leadership.

Defense Secretary Topping, upon return to the Pentagon, called in his special assistant, his comptroller, and his Assistant Secretary on Manpower and gave them instructions for "crash" action. The special assistant was instructed to prepare a memorandum on the economic effects of each of the alternative courses of action. The comptroller was instructed to set the wheels in motion for all financial authority necessary (62:96) The Assistant for Manpower was instructed to draw up necessary papers for a callup of the Reserve and National Guard (62:96).

Task Force No. 3 (Military) began with a review and continued updating of Operation X (61:50), an invasion plan of Carribbea that had first been drawn up 3 months past. It was brought up to the hour with revisions for specified places and timing. Concurrently, it gave instructions that each of the alternative military courses of action listed by the President be war gamed.

After some discussion, it was decided that inasmuch as any military action would be essentially sea and air—at least at the outset before placing any ground forces on Carribbea—the Chief of Naval Operations be designated the operational commander (7:26) (61:50), subject to final decision by the Commander in Chief. In turn, his principal deputies would be the Commander of the Atlantic Fleet (CINCLANT), the Commanding General of the Army Forces, Atlantic (CINCARLANT), and the Commanding General of the Air Forces, Atlantic (CINCAFLANT) (96:11).

It was further decided that sea, air, and land forces should be immediately deployed into pre-positions designed to carry out any of the listed alternative courses of military action instead of waiting until the decision was made by the President on which course of action to take initially. This entailed the movement of Army divisions, Air Force units, and naval forces to the southeastern United States—a concentration of Air Force units at Ramey Air Force Base in Puerto Rico—rushing marines to the Guantanamo Naval Base—and the positioning of naval vessels in the Caribbean area, particularly around the Windward Passage and the Mona Passage and that portion of the North Atlantic between the two passages.

Task Force No. 4 (Legal) first indulged in self-analysis and concluded that its mission was more than just determining the legal aspects of each of the alternative courses, but instead included the drafting of such proclamations (61:52), statements or addresses that the President might make.

Task Force No. 5 (Information) in very short order came to the conclusion that its mission was to get the word out once the final decision had been made—and to not only get the word to the American and foreign press in such form as the President decided but to the key Members of Congress—and to the people of the Caribbean and Latin America areas, especially to the people of Carribbea.

"Cross-Fertilization"

Once all task forces had gotten well underway on their own identifications of their missions and plans to execute those missions, a "cross-fertilization" of inquiries and exchange of opinions between the task forces set in. It was this "cross-fertilization" that actually, even though unconsciously, not only informally coordinated the work of the task forces—but, more important, veered them gradually to some grounds of agreement despite their differing original courses.

For example, the Kremlinologists of Team A of Task Force 2 (diplomatic-political) contacted Task Force 4 (legal) stressing the importance of the legality factor with the report that the Russians "had a feeling for 'legality'" (19:6) and that a good legal basis and presentation would undoubtedly have a sobering effect on the Russians.

Team B (Western Hemisphere affairs) members of Task Force 2 advised Task Force 5 (information) of its opinion that getting information to the people of the Caribbean and Latin American areas, as soon as possible after the principal decision had been made, was extremely desirable psychologically. They requested Task Force 5 to develop plans for requests to selected American radio stations to beam special broadcasts in Spanish once the decision had been made and approval given by the President.

Task Force 2 (diplomatic-political) and Task Force 3 (military) were continuously calling Task Force 1 (intelligence) for the latest intelligence not only on U–2, RF–101 and F–8U photos of the critical sites and area but also for related intelligence with respect to the Soviets and Latin America. These three task forces exchanged opinions not only as to intelligence clues on Khrushchev's real intentions on Carribbea itself but also as a part of the overall pattern on tactics and strategy.

Task Force 2 queried Task Force 3 on the extent of our military strength to back up alternative diplomatic actions, threats and commitments. In turn, Task Force 3 queried Task Force 2 for frank appraisal of what support we could expect from our allies—specifically NATO—as to the best evaluations of their intentions on giving military support. Would they be alienated by a blockade? If the matter was taken first to the U.N. and the OAS for debate before action. how long would it take? How much time would be taken by diplomatic maneuvering—precious time in which military forces could be deployed and prepositioned?

Task Force Reporting

The chairman of each task force reported at least every 4 hours to the Designate for further reporting to the President. These Designates, in turn, did two things—first, they relayed the reports with their personal observations to Jack Brandt, the President's Special Adviser on National Security Affairs—second, they met with each other twice a day to report to each other, to discuss and exchange opinions.

Their reports were then amalgamated into one report prepared by Brandt for the President (43:65). From time to time, the President called one or more of them in to ask questions and to consult further—and to request further information.

Time Closes In

This process continued around the clock for 4 days. In midafternoon of the fourth day, CIA Director Scott Davidson went to the office of Jack Brandt, the President's Special Adviser on National Security Affairs and with grim face said to Brandt, "Our decision planning time has about run out. I've got to see the President."

With automatic reflex, Brandt said, "Let's go," and they walked directly to the office of the President where they were immediately ushered in. As soon as the door closed, Davidson tersely said, "Mr. President, our time for deliberation has run out. The aerial photo reconnaissance (7:18–25) (86:38–41) (108:29) over Carribbea strongly indicates that the Russian buildup is going at such an amazing pace that their missiles will be fully installed and operational and their bombers will be completely assembled and operational within a week." (2:16)

"That settles it then," the President concluded, "Jack, call a meeting of the Executive Committee of the NSC for tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock. Tell the task forces to be prepared with their final recommendations for tomorrow will be D-day—decision day—for me."

Chapter VII. Task forces' recommendations

The next morning the President opened the meeting on the dot of 9 o'clock with the short statement of "Gentlemen, as you may know, photo reconnaissance over Carribbea in the past 4 days reveals that the Russians and their Carribbea puppets will be ready to go operationally with their missiles and bombers there against us within a week (2:16). And as you may have guessed, I have not finally decided—but I can no longer delay my final decision. That is what this meeting is for—to hear from the task forces—and the Cabinet members under whom they have worked. We'll start first with the CIA Director heading Task Force No. 1—the Intelligence Task Force. Speak up, Scott."

Intelligence recommends air strikes

CIA Director Davidson pounded and emptied his pipe on the ash tray stand adjacent to his chair as he started with "There is basically nothing that I can add on behalf of the Intelligence Task Force to the briefing that I gave you the other day—other than to state that the situation has grown graver. In our opinion, the Carribbea-Russian forces will be in an operational position, at their present rate of buildup, to strike us within a week or 10 days at the latest. If we are going to take any action other than a protest, we are going to have to take it within the next 2 or 3 days. We just can't wait even a week.

"Were we of the Intelligence Task Force making the decision, we would act first and talk later. For in our opinion, thus far, talk has gotten us practically nowhere. We recommend selective air strikes not only on the missiles (87:E11) (98:A2) and the bombers in place on Carribbea—but also air strikes on the oil refineries and petroleum depots to cripple general operations in Carribbea—strikes to be made without warning for our intelligence estimates are that any advance threat or notice would result in the Russians flying heavy concentrations of their own aircraft in Carribbea ahead of us if they can.

"We believe that the best course of action is fait accompli because we have again lost credibility with the Russians and this is the action that is necessary to restore that credibility. That's our recommendation."

It was clear from the expression on the President's face that this recommendation troubled him as he turned to the Diplomatic-Political Task Force No. 2 Chairman, the Under Secretary of State, and said, "All right, now let's have the advice of the Diplomatic-Political Task Force."

Diplomats Recommend Political Negotiation

Slowly clearing his throat, the Under Secretary of State, in the formal tone that had been ingrained in him as a career foreign service officer, said, "Mr. President, we believe that we must arrive at the kind of measured response that would remove the threat by (a) posing a minimum risk to ourselves and our allies, (b) involve a minimum danger of escalation toward higher orders of violence, (c) be consistent with our treaty obligations, and (d) not contravene the principles for which we stand as a nation. (9:A12) (107:1)

"Mr. President, Task Force No. 2 is of the firm opinion that we should make at least one more try at reason with the Russians. We prefer political negotiation to military action. I want to point out, in this respect, that this preference is fully concurred in

by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs (10:20), who is regarded as the key person at the crossroads of State-Defense-JCS relations (79:3)—and between the two focal points for 'military' and 'political' advice (109:39).

"To take military action against Carribbea, either by invasion or by selected air strikes, would not only cost us friends and allies in Latin America (61:50), but would brand us as an aggressor in the eyes of the world. It would probably result in the killing and injury of Russian military and technical personnel in Carribbea, which could lead to nuclear retaliation on our country by Khrushchev and we would be escalated into that which we all want to avoid—an all-out nuclear war. Public support for U.S. foreign policy to be effective is absolutely necessary (38:59). We doubt if the American public favors an invasion.

"We recommend that we take the case to the United Nations and to the Organization of American States and show that the peace of the world is threatened, and the security of the Western Hemisphere is jeopardized, by the Russian buildup in Carribbea. We believe that the United Nations will face up to the situation and act just as it did in Korea—and that the OAS member states will at least see the threat and solidly back us."

Military Recommend Invasion

No reaction was registered by the President, who then said, "How about the Military Task Force?"

The Deputy Secretary of Defense stood and said, "Mr. President, it is the considered judgment of the Military Task Force that military action is mandatory and urgent. We do not believe that the Russians will respond to political negotiation. We agree with the conclusion that we have again lost our credibility with the Russians because we have bent over backwards so long in prolonged talk in this protracted conflict of the cold war that they doubt that we will act. We believe that military action is necessary to restore that credibility.

"Nor do we believe that we can obtain the necessarily effective reaction and prompt action in taking our case to the United Nations or the Organization of American States. In the first place, we have seen how our traditional allies—specifically our NATO allies—acted when we tried to persuade them not to trade with Abuc a few years ago and how they initially protested our quarantine as violation of freedom of the seas (16:35).

"We have seen how the so-called neutral nations, who held themselves in such righteous indignation as the moral arbiters of the world, how they were so silent when Khrushchev resumed open-air nuclear tests (13:56) and when Red China invaded the leading neutralist nation, India. And we have seen in the past how difficult it was to gain support from the members of the OAS through attempted persuasion—but how, when we exercised our power and acted, they fell in step behind us in solid unity.

"No, we believe that military action is absolutely necessary in this crisis. For further detail on why and what action we believe should be taken, with your permission, I would like to defer now to the Vice Chairman of the Military Task Force, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Maxwell."

As the President nodded his approval, Gen. Tigh Maxwell strode over to a map on an easel and picked up a pointer. "Mr. President," he said, "what I am about to say is the unanimous opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (26:125, 136). Khrushchev has caught us with our southern flank exposed (71:8). Your attention is first called to this narrow water strait between Carribbea and Cuba—the Windward Passage—and to the Mona Passage between Carribbea and Puerto Rico. We believe that among the principal reasons for Khrushchev's grab for Carribbea is his overall strategy of gaining control of the narrow water passages throughout the world—the Suez Canal, Gibraltar, the Skaggerak, the Dardanelles, the Malacca Straits, the Panama Canal (49:83, 92)—and the Windward Passage and the Mona Passage here.

"If he remains in Carribbea, not only does he present an immediate threat of missile and bomber attacks on our country from Caribbea (68:A–14)—but also a longer range threat of taking over control of the waters approaching the Panama Canal. Not only that, he would greatly neutralize and offset the present military-geographical defensive advantage that we have against unfriendly Caribbea in the Guantanamo Naval Base to her west and Puerto Rico to her east. So much for the Western Hemisphere.

"Now let us look at Europe—and specifically at Berlin. If Khrushchev establishes nuclear-capable, operational missile, bomber and submarine forces in Carribbea, he offsets the present wide advantage and superiority that we have over Russia on ICBM operational capability (99:A15). By such a military 'leap frog' action he will drastically change the missile balance of power (120:46) presently from one of a decided inferiority to one of a clear superiority for Russia.

"For if he moves to take Berlin and to push us out and we threaten to resist, he can then point to his missiles in Caribbea poised to zero in on us. Then we have the choice of backing down or not only of fighting a nuclear war in a place of his choosing but also of his having the ability to rain nuclear bombs on us that he does not now have.

"We do not believe that he is prepared to go to war now—and particularly in an area to his own disadvantage—in the Caribbean Sea—which has been regarded as an American ocean. But if Mr. Khrushchev is ready to go to nuclear war over Carribbea now, he is ready to go to war now or at any future time (61:16) in other places throughout the world far more to his advantage geographically. If he is going to launch missiles from Carribbea, he will simultaneously launch them from the Soviet Union itself (66:A–23).

"We think he's bluffing—otherwise he has picked the wrong war in the wrong area and at the wrong time. And we think he is bluffing from a combination of his own desperate weakness of ICBM inferiority (99:A15) and the lack of our own credibility in his mind. He's bluffing like we did on the ultimatum for him to get out of Laos and when we did nothing when he called that bluff. We think the tables are reversed now.

"We believe we must take military action to call his bluff—again to restore our credibility—and to prevent him from drastically changing the balance of military power by this one bold, desperate attempted leapfrog, this attempted blackmail (55:60).

"That action can range from an air and sea blockade to all-out invasion. We think the most realistic step is the most unpleasant step—invasion. For even if we do blockade and the Russian missiles and bombers are taken out of Carribbea, the Communist government will still be there—and still constitute a potential threat to the peace of the Western Hemisphere and ultimately to our own security."

"We have the necessary capacity (54:A–10) and strength (59:A1, A4) (96:11) (117:A–1, A–5) (96:11) (117:A–1, A–5) for a successful, full-scale invasion (20:37), which could be completed within a few days—or, at the most, a month, if the resistance is strong (61:50)."

General Maxwell then gently laid his pointer at the base of the map and walked back to his seat.

The President then pointed to the Deputy Attorney General and said, "You're up now for the Legal Task Force."

Lawyers Recommend Blockade

"Mr. President, the members of the Legal Task Force are neither military experts nor political-diplomatic experts, so we are somewhat embarrassed to recommend outside the legal aspects. But you have asked us to—and we will—and admittedly with our opinion being dominated by the legal aspects of military action or political negotiation.

"We are opposed to invasion because we do not believe that there is a sound legal basis for it. We are a highly moral-conscious Nation and people—and 'legal' is but another term for 'moral'—for what is right morally. For the same reason, we are opposed to selected air strikes or any other similar military action. We do not want the United States placed in the position of a Pearl Harbor in reverse.

"On the other hand, we can see a sound legal basis for an air and sea blockade against military shipments as contrasted to food, shelter, and medicinal shipments to Carribbea. It would particularly have a sound legal basis if we were to place the proposed blockade before the United Nations and the Organization of American States for their approval. This is what we recommend."

Information Recommendations

All eyes then shifted to the Director of the U.S. Information Agency, the Chairman of the Information Task Force, as the President nodded in his direction. His brow wrinkled and his eyebrows shifted up and down as he looked up with a reticent smile and through the smoke of the ever-present cigarette that had become his trademark in the past pre-Government days with TV audiences.

"I feel as though I was about to do a TV documentary, Mr. President. My Information Task Force is sharply divided on the big decision, although it is unanimous on what to do once that big decision is made, whatever it is. We're practically evenly divided between military action and political negotiation. Perhaps the Deputy Attorney General has given us the easy way out with the middle compromise his task force recommends.

"But, of this, we are unanimous and sure. Whatever the decision—it must be given to as many people as quickly as it can be (93:1, 2)—so that they may know why we have made the decision that we have. And it should be announced as dramatically as possible and with the maximum impact.

"In a democratic society the public must be kept informed of the major issues in national defense policy. It is extremely important that public opinion in our own country vigorously support the decision. It is extremely important that the message be gotten across to the people of Latin America (35:12)—and especially to the people of Carribbea. We must get the message through to the Russian people. We must use all the facilities at our command. Even in this crisis, the truth must be our guide, but dreams must be our goal—dreams of peace (114:4).

"Not only are the media of communication of great importance—but for impact purposes, the forum or forums of communication are of the greatest importance—for the atmosphere, the arena and the surroundings of the message can well control the mental and emotional manner in which the message is received.

"For that reason, we recommend that the President make the announcement of his decision—what it is and why—in the world's foremost international forum, the United Nations. As soon as the decision has been made, we recommend that the President request a time to go before the General Assembly of the United Nations to make an address of utmost importance. We further recommend that such address be televised to the world through our communications

satellites Telstar II and Skyfon, thus taking advantage of the U.N. multilingual concurrent translations. We recommend that the Vice Persident shortly thereafter go before the Organization of American States with substantially the same message on behalf of the President.

"Finally, not only do we recommend that all Government broadcast facilities such as VOA (92:1), the AFRTS (78:76) and RIAS (111:86) be assigned to such broadcasts, but also that powerful American commercial non-Government radio stations, that can beam broadcasts to Latin America, be used for such purposes, preferably through voluntary cooperation—but mandatory, if necessary, through national security authority. Any other recommendations we have, Mr. President, deal only with detailed implementation of your decision—and add nothing to the discussion at this time."

PART 3. DECISION

Chapter VIII. NSC members' recommendation

At that point the President pivoted his chair around to face Jack Brandt, his Special Adviser on National Security Affairs, and said, "Jack, you have been coordinating the work of the task forces—and I must say that, in my judgment, the task forces have done an excellent job in spite of their different conclusions and recommendations—they have gone forward with vigor—and you have had the best overall knowledge of the work and the recommendations. Because of that I want to have your opinion and recommendations."

Special Adviser on National Security Affairs

Edging to the front of his chair and biting his lower lip, Brandt said, "It may appear that I'm bellicose—and maybe I am—maybe I'm on the 'hard' side between the division of your 'hard' and 'soft' advisers (55:60)—but the more I think on this and the more information that we get, the more I am convinced that this is really the moment of truth in the cold war up to this point—and that we have no choice but to take a calculated risk of nuclear confrontation that admittedly has a dangerous chance of escalating into nuclear war.

"In my opinon, Khrushchev is either proceeding from great strength or great weakness. If he is proceeding from great strength, then I think he is willing to start a nuclear war now or at any time in the future. So that I don't think that in the long run any temporizing expedient such as political negotiation in the United Nations will either bring peace or enhance our national security.

"It only delays the day of reckoning. And a delay now, that permits him missile, bomber, and submarine operational capability in Carribbea, strengthens him and weakens us in the balance-of-power struggle.

"Because we are so far ahead of him on ICBM strength (99:A15), I am convinced he is leading from weakness. We have the conventional strength with which to invade Carribbea—and I think the term 'liberate' is more accurate and better psychologically than the term 'invade.' Khrushchev doesn't have the conventional strength to match ours—and especially with his enormous problem of logistics, as he would have to fight far from his source of supplies, while we fight almost in our own backyard.

"Thus, it seems to me that the only choice left for him is to decide whether Carribbea is sufficiently in the national interest of Russia—in the long-term strategy of communism—to fight a nuclear war. I don't think it is—because not only do we now have a great ICBM superiority over him but a clear nuclear superiority (120:46).

"No, I think he'll back down—and run away to confront us another day at some other place of greater advantage to him—just like he did in the Abuc crisis. In short, he has again doubted our credibility because we didn't push against his submarine—phony fishing—bases in Abuc. I think this is the chance to prove our credibility to him again. If we don't do it now—it will be that much harder later on—and perhaps fatally impossible.

"Im for all-out liberation military action on Carribbea instead of timid political negotiation. Any in-between action such as blockade or air strikes is only a difference in degree for once we take an act of confrontation, the risk of war is one. The principle is the same as declaration of war from the standpoint of risk—the difference is only in degree."

Decision Count-Down

The President slowly turned his chair as if the words of Brandt had fallen very heavily upon him. There was a long silence in the room as the President thought of how the survival of the world in the next few days depended upon his wisdom and courage—upon how well he could guess—and upon the frightening unknown of how sane and prudent a man Khrushchev really was—or was not—through all of his bluster and bluff. Only the President could make the decision (109:41).

"We must bring this discussion to a close—and I am going to do this by asking the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, and the Vice President in that order to express their opinions and recommendations. My mind is made up sufficiently at this point to disclose my decision to you when they have finished—but I want to hear them one more time because what they have to say may change my mind in some respects and in some details. Art Burgess, will you start it off and make it as short as possible?"

Secretary of State—Diplomacy

The Secretary of State emitted a sigh audible throughout the room and started with "My position is not easy, Mr. President, but I still believe that there must be left an ounce of reasonableness in Khrushchev. Perhaps we could discuss with him the possibility of our dismantling our missile bases in Turkey if he will do the same in Abuc (1:A21) (69:A25) (75:B–1) (98:A1), as suggested by Columnist Pearlipp and the conservative press in London (50:404).

"Russian history shows a clear pattern of Russia itself refraining from initiating military action except from fear (64:A–13). I do not think we have yet reached the disastrous point where our differences cannot be discussed at the diplomatic table—where we have to start shooting instead of talking. If we shoot, then I think we will destroy the last shred of any reasonableness left in Khrushchev. He will shoot back and the escalation game will be on and will not end until all-out nuclear war has perhaps killed off the entire world.

"I do not like to wear my war record on my sleeve—but I have no choice at this time. As a holder of the Congressional Medal of Honor for action in World War II, I say with all the sincerity of which I am capable that we should not take military action—we should not act unilaterally—we should take our case to the United Nations and the Organization of American States."

Secretary of Defense—Controlled Response and Options

The depth and warmth of feeling with which Secretary of State Arthur Burgess spoke was in sharp contrast to the detached, unemotional, and seemingly cold tone in which Defense Secretary Topping spoke. To some, he was seemingly an electronic, mechanical computer that had taken on human form (62:95). The few close, close friends he had, protested that such characterization did not do the man justice (62:99). But throughout the discussions on the crisis, his image was certainly more than of an electronic machine than that of a mortal human being with emotions and fears.

"It is my concept, Mr. President," he began, "that while this crisis presents grave danger to us, it also gives us a golden opportunity (92:96) in more than one respect. First, it is a golden opportunity because we can make a stand—a confrontation—in an area of the world to our advantage and to the disadvantage of Khrushchev—militarily because of the logistics factor—weaponwise because of our conventional advantage in equipment, in our strike command, in our naval control of the Caribbean—and psychologically in the deeply instilled feeling of the Latinos against foreign control.

"Second, it gives us a golden opportunity to reconvince Khrushchev, beyond any doubt, of our credibility—and I mean specifically nuclear credibility, which the woman Senator alleged we have again lost when we failed to push against his submarine bases in Abuc. I must admit that she apparently was right to some extent because otherwise Khrushchev would not have had the nerve to attempt making Carribbea a submarine, missile, and nuclear bomber base against us. For if we stand—with our conventional superiority at this particular place on the globe—Khrushchev cannot hope to fight a conventional war with us. He then has no choice but nuclear war or a backdown.

"That brings me to the third reason why I feel this is a golden opportunity. It is a golden opportunity for us because it is we, who have the choice. It is we, who have what I call the power of controlled response (3:24) and the exercise of options (2:20). We maintain the initiative from the start—we act first—Khruschev can be kept constantly in the position of reacting and countering. And this is certainly a refreshing change for us.

"We are not in the position of our choice being limited to a surrendering backdown or starting a nuclear war. We have the options (2:20)—and several of them. We can plan step by step. We can force Khrushchev to make the decision to raise the threshold—to escalate—instead of having that decision forced upon us.

"Our missile bases in Turkey are about outmoded and we have been on the verge of removing them (88:B23)—the Joint Chiefs of Staff have made this decision because we have enough intercontinental missiles so that we no longer need the intermediate range missiles (89:D13) in Turkey.

"But the suggestion of a dismantling trade on missile bases in Abuc and Turkey is unthinkable because Turkey is in NATO and this would undermine the confidence of all other NATO nations in us.

"I vigorously oppose limiting our action to an appeal to the United Nations and the Organization of American States. I oppose starting our action that way because it would waste the loss of valuable time—and that could be fatal.

"Nor do I agree with CIA Director Davidson that we make air strikes without warning—or with your Special Adviser on National Security Affairs and with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that we should invade Carribbea. Either action would limit our options and reduce our controlled response.

"Instead I propose that the first step to be taken be the imposition of a sea and air blockade of Carribbea (98:A1) and that it be maintained until Carribbea and Russia do two things. First, they must dismantle and ship out of Carribbea not only all missiles and bombers but all Communist military equipment, whether from Russia or any of her satellites. Second, I propose further that the blockade be maintained until inspection teams from the Organization of

American States can fully determine that such action has been taken.

"A deadline should be set for the beginning of the dismantling and removal of the missiles, bombers, and submarines—within 48 hours after the announcement of the imposition of the blockade. That deadline should have teeth in it with the notice that unless such dismantling starts within that time we will then exercise what I call our second option—our second degree of controlled response—the bombing of some missile sites.

"If that does not start the Russians dismantling within 24 hours, then I recommend the exercise of our third option—our third degree of controlled response—a full-scale invasion of Carribbea. Our readiness now is such that we can, in my opinion, make successful landings and occupy all of Carribbea within a few days because of present maneuvers that are going on and the concentration of forces we have built up in Florida, Puerto Rico, and Panama. Even if we should run into resistance, complete occupation could be achieved in a month (61:50).

"At no time should we use nuclear explosives first. We should force that decision upon Khrushchev. We should retain the 'conventional option' (3:24). Only after Khrushchev's first use of nuclear explosives should we consider nuclear retaliation according to the damage caused, and the intent indicated, by his use of nuclear explosives. If Khrushchev attacks U.S. soil, then I propose war plan AA–1, which you know in detail, be invoked.

"I recognize that a President is often left to figure out his options for himself (77:56, 57)—but these are my recommended options."

Attorney General—To U.N. and OAS First

Looking at the Attorney General, the President said, "All right, Ken, let's have your final word."

"I am in basic agreement with the Secretary of State that this should first be taken to the United Nations and the Organization of American States. I am bitterly opposed to either air strikes or invasion as I feel this would be immoral—particularly to strike without warning just to have the military advantage of surprise," was the response of the Attorney General.

"I think that we should take the legal step of appeal to the international and regional bodies of the U.N. and OAS first—for actually that is appealing to the highest legal authority there is—the court of world opinion. The U.N. and OAS are our forums—our media of communication—for appeal to the court of world opinion (51:1).

"I admit that we have a good chance of quick military victory with a surprise air attack or invasion. But in the long run (45:20), I think we will lose from it—we will have won a battle but lost a war—for where we now have world opinion on our side, we would lose it—by military attack—and Khrushchev would gain it.

"But I have changed my mind somewhat since the beginning of our discussions. I am no longer completely opposed to any military action—with some reluctance I can see the advantage of the military action of a blockade since it would not mean actual shooting unless Russian ships—or potentially, even ships of our NATO Allies—might try to run the blockade. Even then I don't like the idea of a blockade in that it cuts off shipments of some necessities to the people of Carribbea.

"If your decision should be a blockade or an advance warning of air strike of missile and bomber sites or possible invasion, I feel that we still should go before the United Nations and the OAS with such notice before acting. To that extent we would at least have the semblance—and the image with some—of having acted legally or with a legal basis. And even the legal predicate approach, our Kremlinologists tell us, makes a salutary impression on the Russians (19:6).

"It's a little like the difference between straight touch football and 'flag' football, where grabbing the detachable flag from the waist of the ball carrier removes any doubt and avoids any argument as to whether the ball carrier has been touched or not. And now that I've gone off on touch football I'll stop."

Vice President—All the Way—Invasion

Turning to Vice President Jim Landon, the President said, "Jim, the final quarterback call is yours."

"My first point, Mr. President, is that I disagree with the Attorney General that invasion or air strike would be a reverse Pearl Harbor—an attack without warning. After all for months now—yes, even years—you have been warning that the United States would not tolerate threats to the security of the Western Hemisphere. You have even spelled that out by specifically identifying any Russian offensive military buildup in any nation in the Western Hemisphere as a threat to the security of the hemisphere.

"I'm afraid that the Attorney General, like so many Americans, has been somewhat confused in his thinking by the result of the steady deterioration of our military credibility after the first flush of victory on Abuc wore off—to the extent that our strong words of warning have little, if any, meaning because we did not back up those strong words with strong action on the submarine bases in Abuc. In other words, that our past strong words of warning so lost their meaning by lack of backup action that they have not been considered actually to be warnings.

"I don't like the limited action of a blockade—because even if you do get the Communist missiles, bombers, and submarines removed—and it will not be easy to determine when, and if, that has been done in view of the way the Russians and their puppets have lied—and specifically in denying all along that they were building up in Carribbea. As I started to say, even if you get the missiles, bombers, and submarines removed, you still will not have removed the basic threat—the continued existence of a Communist government in Carribbea that would destroy our country anytime the Communists thought it could be done" (65:A–19).

"The only real way to remove that threat—to cut out the cancer soon enough—is to overthrow the Communist regime—and the only way to do that is by invasion and occupation.

"Let us not delude ourselves on two points that have been raised—on the moral issue—and on the claim that psychologically we would lose the friendship of the Latinos by invasion. If a criminal faces you with a cocked gun on the verge of killing you and then terrorizing your neighbors and your community, whether you are a policeman or not, it is your moral duty to shoot him not only in self-defense but for the protection of your neighbors and your community.

"As for the psychological reaction of the Latinos, make no mistake about it. They respect power (120:46). Historically they have always responded to power. They have contempt for any country that does not use its power for its defense and for its dignity and self-respect. I know—because I have traveled and talked with the man in the street in Latin America. To a man and woman, they have told me that while their politicians would probably have criticized us for a short time if we had invaded Abuc at the time of the invasion fiasco at Quahog Bay, inwardly they would have had much more respect for us if we had gone all the way and thrown out that bearded 'psycho' Ortsac (19:6).

"So I say that we shouldn't throw away this second chance to do the right thing—to go all the way—to invade, throw out the Communist regime and liberate Carribbea with a free, democratic government.

"I have only one further thought. If you should decide to announce publicly your decision in advance by going to the United Nations as recommended by the USIA Director, I believe that you should also go before the Organization of American States instead of me going before the OAS—because the Latinos are proud people and they would feel slighted if you went before the United Nations and did not go before the OAS. Psychologically, they are just as important, if not more important, than the people of Europe and Asia on this matter. That's my say—it's your ball now, Coach."

Chapter IX. Final Presidential decisions

Measured Choices

There was a long silence. Then the President leaned forward placing his elbows on his desk and said, "Thank you, gentlemen. I have made my final judgment (58:A1). Actually it is not a matter of decisions—but rather a matter of choices (77:56, 57)—measured choices (73:E1). It is this—a course of action to start at a minimum place (54:A–10) (118:A–6) with a blockade to get the missiles, bombers and submarines out of Carribbea and, if necessary, to escalate upward first to air strikes and then to invasion.

"I shall observe certain legal and psychological aspects by taking the matter to the U.N. and the OAS and to the American people in broadcasts tomorrow—broadcasts announcing the blockade order and the ultimatum but not disclosing the potential escalating steps—broadcasts that I want sent to every possible person in the world through Telstar II, Skyfon and all the major TV and radio networks and the Voice of America, RIAS and all our facilities for oversea broadcast.

Blockade—Limited

"Now specifically, I have decided to order a sea and air blockade against all shipments of war materials (118:A–6) to Carribbea. The definition and list of war materials will be spelled out by the Legal Task Force and the Military Task Force working together. But it shall specifically include oil (68:A–14). I have decided to cover the oil factor in this manner first rather than following the recommendation of air strikes (72:A–31) on petroleum facilities in Carribbea because of the time and effort it would take to restore such facilities to Carribbea's economy and daily life should they be destroyed. And it shall specifically exclude all items for food, shelter and health of the people of Carribbea.

"The blockade shall start day after tomorrow—D-day—at 6 a.m. and continue until all missiles, bombers and submarines have been removed from Carribbea (118:A–6)—both offensive and defensive because I don't want any loopholes given to the Russians.

"The blockade shall cover the range of longitude 67° W. to 75° W. and latitude 17° N. to 21° N. Pursuant to the previous recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the blockade shall be commanded by the Chief of Naval Operations."

Give Enemy Time To Think

"I want to avoid the mistake that has been made too often in past wars—the failure to give the enemy a face-saving manner in which to retreat and back down. In this case I want Khrushchev to be able to determine in his own mind that he can honorably back down (70:E1) and that he does not have to start war. I want to give him time to think. (2:16) (4:94)

"For that reason I want the first Russian ship approaching or entering the blockade zone to be permitted to pass through without challenge (73:E1). I think that will give the message to Khrushchev to pause—that we are still reasonable and that he still has

the opportunity to back down gracefully and with face.

"However, if he doesn't back down after the first ship is permitted to pass through—then from that time on I want the challenges and inspections with each successive ship entering the blockade zone to be stepped up and become stronger. In other words, stop the second ship but make only a token inspection—then with the third ship make a more detailed inspection, and so on—thus showing Khrushchev we really mean business but that he can still get himself out of the situation peacefully."

Ultimatum To Remove Offensive Weapons

"The declaration of the blockade shall carry an ultimatum that unless dismantling and removal of the missiles and bombers—and removal of submarines and deactivation of submarine bases—starts within 48 hours after the declaration, we shall take military action to render ineffective such weapons and facilities. But we shall not disclose or tip our hands as to what that military action will be.

"I shall announce in the blockade declaration that in order for us to determine whether such dismantling and removal has started within the ultimatum period, that I am ordering continuous aerial reconnaissance and inspection of Carribbea both by high flights by our U–2's and low-level flights at 200 feet (4:93) (53:A–12) (54:A–10) by our RF–101 Voodoos and F–8U Crusaders."

Second Option—Air Strikes

"If such dismantling and removal does not start within the 48-hour ultimatum period, then I have decided that the first offensive military action shall be three air strikes—one against the principal missile site, one against the principal group of bombers, and one against the principal submarine base—all to be made simultaneously at 7 a.m. on D-plus-two day at 1 hour after the expiration of the ultimatum."

Third Option—Invasion

"If these air strikes do not produce a favorable response within 24 hours, then the second offensive military action will be taken with a full-scale invasion of Carribbea, including air strikes against all missile, bomber, and submarine sites. Major forces for the invasion operation shall be SAC and StrikCom (95:19) (96:11).

"Any further offensive military action will depend upon the response to the invasion. Should Russia strike our country, then we shall proceed with the first stage of Operation AA–1, which I have already authorized to the Joint Chiefs of Staff upon a contingency basis."

Take Case to United Nations

"At the close of this meeting, I want the Ambassador to the United Nations to make two requests to the U.N. The first request will be for me to address the General Assembly on an undisclosed matter of extreme urgency at 6 p.m. tomorrow night. The second request will be for an extraordinary meeting of the U.N. Security Council immediately following my address at which time our Ambassador to the U.N. will present our case (47:A–4) (97:A–1) (110:A–21) and call upon Russian to remove the missiles, bombers, and submarines from Carribbea—and ask for adoption of a resolution calling for such action if Russia refuses."

Take Case to Organization of American States

"Also at the close of this meeting, I want our Ambassador to the "Organization of American States to request an extraordinary session of the OAS in Washington for tomorrow night at 8 p.m.—giving me time to return from the U.N. in New York—at which time I shall make an address similar to my U.N. speech but in which I shall call upon the OAS to adopt a resolution which our Ambassador will present immediately following my address.

"That resolution shall propose condemnation of Russian interference in the Western Hemisphere and pledge Western Hemispheric solidarity in support of the decisions I will have announced in my U.N. and OAS addresses. It shall also request the other members of the OAS to provide military and economic support to the United States on the Carribbea crisis. I shall propose in both my U.N. address and my OAS address that the OAS send inspection teams into Carribbea to determine if missiles, bombers, and submarines have been removed following the ultimatum."

Take Case to American People

"Because I want to capture the eyes and ears (119:42) of the people and to enlist their support (119:43), at 10 p.m. I want to make a brief 10- to 15-minute TV and radio report to the American people explaining the urgent necessity of my action (12:35) stating that for the implementation of my decisions, as announced in my U.N. and OAS speeches, I am declaring a national emergency and, under previously enacted congressional authority, am preparing for mobilization of all Ready Reservists and National Guardsmen. The greatest importance of this, for the time being, is to remove any lingering doubt in Khrushchev's mind about our credibility."

Psychological Moves

"And on this psychological score of credibility—again to get the message across to Khrushchev loud and clear that we mean business—even nuclear war, if necessary—I want two other steps to be taken. First, I want all families and civilians evacuated from the Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba and Ramey Air Force Base and all of our military and naval facilities in Puerto Rico.

"Second, I want low level photo-reconnaissance flights (53:A12) to be made at noon sharp on D-day right over the main streets of Port au Prince and Santo Domingo—close enough for the people in the streets to see clearly the United States markings of our planes and even our cameras, if possible."

Diplomatic Notices

"Three hours preceding my U.N. address, I want our Ambassador to the NATO organization to inform that organization of the contents of my address—and simultaneously our Ambassadors to each nation with which we have a security pact. While this is an American decision made unilaterally, I want to touch all bases (101:A21) with our key allies as well as the U.N. and OAS (11:48). Russia and her satellite countries, including Carribbea, shall not be notified by our Embassies until 1 hour before (103:9) the very beginning of my U.N. address."

Congressional Briefing

"Tomorrow at 3 p.m., I want to hold a meeting here with the Speaker of the House, the majority and minority leaders of the Senate and the House, the Senate and House chairmen and ranking minority members of the Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Relations Committees (61:54)—together with the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—to brief them on my decisions, and reasons therefor, prior to my U.N. address—and to request that they make preparations for a possible call of a special session to take appropriate legislative action—even declaration of war, if necessary."

NSC Meeting To Formalize Decisions

"Now I want the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and my Special Adviser for National Security Affairs to remain for a routine meeting of the National Security Council to formalize my decisions. Jack, get Emergency Planning Director Tom Kelly over here immediately—he's the only NSC member who is not a member of this Executive Committee and not here now."

Decision—A Collective Process

"That's it, gentlemen. Only God knows if we have decided right—yes, perhaps even more accurately, if we have guessed right—made the wise choices. I could not have asked more from you. Collectively you have really guided (53:A12) (54:A–10) (118:A–6) and formed my decisions even though only I could make the final decisions—and even though probably none of you agree completely with all facets of my decisions. I could not have had a better team."

Divine Decision

"And in closing this meeting, I ask that you bow your heads and join me in a prayer to Almighty God, who is really the one who will make the final decision in this matter: 'Almighty God, we pray that we may do your will—that our decisions are in reality your decisions—and that in these decisions and our actions we will bring and preserve peace to everyone, regardless of nation, in this world. Amen'."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Alsop, Joseph, "Matter of Fact—Kennedy and Stevenson," the Washington Post, December 5, 1962, page A21, Washington, D.C.

2. Alsop, Stewart and Bartlett, Charles, "In Time of Crisis," the Saturday Evening Post, December 8, 1962, pages 15–33, Philadelphia, Pa.

3. Alsop, Stewart, "Master of the Pentagon," the Saturday Evening Post, August 5, 1961, pages 20–21, 45–46. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 6, pages 21–27.

4. "Anatomy of the Cuban Showdown," Reader's Digest, January 1963, pages 93–98, Pleasantville, N.Y.

5. Anderson, Jack, "John McCone, Secrecy Is His Business," Parade magazine, December 16, 1962, pages 6–7, New York, N.Y.

6. "Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs)," Department of Defense Directive 5132.2, May 20, 1961, pages 1–6.

7. "The Backdown—The Showdown," Time, November 2, 1962, pages 15–29, New York, N.Y.

8. Baulch, Jerry T. (Associated Press), "42 IL–28 Jets Shipped Out of Cuba; Last Bomber Removed, Russians Say," the Washington Post, December 7, 1962, pages A1 and A20, Washington, D.C.

9. Ball, George W., "How the Cuban Decision Evolved," (excerpts from an address of Mr. Ball to the New York Lawyer's Association on December 13, 1962), the Washington Post, December 15, 1962, page A12, Washington, D.C.

10. "The Big Flap—Doves, Hawks, 'Dawks,' 'Hove's'," Newsweek, December 17, 1962, pages 17–20, New York, N.Y.

11. Bowie, Robert R., "Analysis of Our Policy Machine," organizing for national security: selected materials. Prepared for the Senate Committee on Government Operations and its Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, 86th Congress, 2d session, committee print, 1960, pages 100–107. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 2, pages 45–49.

12. Carleton, William G., "The Growth of the Presidency," Current History, XXXIX, No. 230, October 1960, pages 193–197. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 4, pages 33–37.

13. Carroll, Wallace, "Kennedy Turns to Power," the New York Times, October 13, 1961, page C–16. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 17, pages 55–56.

14. "Central Intelligence Agency," U.S. Government Organization Manual, 1962–63, revised June 1, 1962, page 57.

15. Central Intelligence Agency Director, nomination of John A. McCone to be; hearing before the Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, 87th Congress, 2d session, January 18, 1962, pages 33–83, Washington, D.C.

16. "Cold War," Time, November 2, 1962, pages 32–36, New York N.Y.

17. Corddry, Charles (United Press International), "Russia Ships 3 IL–28 Jets Out of Cuba," the Washington Post, December 4, 1962, pages A1 and A8, Washington, D.C.

18. "Cuba: Almost a Pearl Harbor?" U.S. News & World Report, November 12, 1962, page 47, Washington, D.C.

18a. "Cuba—Castro Defiant," Time, January 11, 1963, page 35, New York, N.Y.

19. "Cuban Crisis: A Step-by-Step Review," the New York Times, November 3, 1962, pages 1, 6, 7, New York, N.Y.

20. "Cuba Invasion Force Was Set, Shoup Says," Washington Evening Star, January 3, 1963, page A–7.

21. "Defense Intelligence Agency," Department of Defense Directive 5105.21, August 1, 1961, pages 1–8. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 10, pages 51–54.

22. "Defense Intelligence Agency," U.S. Government Organization Manual, 1962–63, revised June 1, 1962, page 197.

23. "Defense Organization," Armed Forces Management, VII, No. 2 (November 1960), pages 21–28. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 2, pages 17–27.

24. "Department of the Air Force," U.S. Government Organization Manual, 1962–63, revised June 1962, pages 180–192.

25. "Department of the Army," U.S. Government Organization Manual, 1962–63, revised June 1, 1962, pages 138–154.

26. "Department of Defense," U.S. Government Organization Manual, 1962–63, revised June 1, 1962, pages 121–137.

27. Department of Defense Telephone Directory, winter 1962–63, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

28. "Department of the Navy," U.S. Government Organization Manual, 1962–63, revised June 1, 1962, pages 155–179.

29. "Department of State," U.S. Government Organization Manual, 1962–63, revised June 1, 1962, pages 63–88.

30. Dille, John, "Daring Missions That Bared Cuba's Secrets," Life (Nov. 2, 1962), pages 42 and 42A.

31. Donovan, Robert J., "Eisenhower—The Inside Story," pages 64–67, 110, 261–268, Harper & Bros., New York, N.Y. (1956).

32. Dulles, Allen W., "Intelligence Estimating and National Security," the Department of State Bulletin, XLII, No. 1081 (Mar. 14, 1960); pages 411–417. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 10, pages 37–43.

32a. "Emergency Planning Director," U.S. Government Organization Manual, 1962–63, revised June 1, 1962, pages 58–61.

33. Evans, Allen, "Intelligence and Policy Formation," World Politics, XII, No. 1 (October 1959), pages 84–91. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 10, pages 17–21.

34. "Extracts from the Conclusions and Recommendations of the President's Committee on Information Activities Abroad," the Department of State Bulletin, XLIV, No. 1128 (Feb. 6, 1961), pages 185–195. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 17, pages 23–25.

35. Finney, John W. and Shuster, Alvin, "The Propaganda War—A Case History and the Rival Systems," the New York Times (June 25, 1961), page E–3. In WNCP, volume II, chapter 17, pages 9–14.

36. Folliard, Edward T., "Cuba Crisis Talks Called for Today," the Washington Post, November 23, 1962, pages A1 and A2, Washington, D.C.

37. "Foreign Relations: World Opinion," Time (Sept. 15, 1961), pages 22–23. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 17, pages 5–6.

38. Foster, H. Schuyler, "The Role of the Public in U.S. Foreign Relations," Department of State Publication 7113, January 1961, pages 1–20. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 17, pages 59–67.

39. "Functions of the Department of Defense and Its Major Components," Department of Defense Directive 5100.1, December 31, 1958, pages 1–13. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 9, pages 7–10.

40. Gilpatric, Roswell L. (Deputy Secretary of Defense), "The Department of Defense and National Security Policy," address before the National War College and Industrial College of the Armed Forces, Washington, D.C., November 22, 1961.

41. Goss, Hilton P., "The Administration and Execution of U.S. Foreign Policy 1960–1975." Tempo RM 59TMP–99 Santa Barbara, Calif., General Electric Co., November 30, 1959, pages 20–29. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 5, pages 69–74.

42. Gray, Gordon, "Organizing for Total Defense," the General Electric Defense Quarterly, III, No. 3 (July–September 1960), pages 4–10. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 2, pages 53–57.

43. Gray, Gordon, "Role of the National Security Council in the Formulation of National Security Policy," organizing for national security: selected materials. Prepared for the Senate Committee on National Policy Machinery, 86th Congress, 2d session, committee print, 1960, pages 62–71. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 2, pages 61–68.

44. Griffith, Ernest S., "Congress: Its Contemporary Role," New York, New York University Press, 1961, pages 124–141 and 142–150.

45. Halle, Louis J., "Eventually Public Opinion Prevails," the New York Times magazine (Oct. 15, 1961), pages 25, 113–114. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 17, pages 17–20.

46. Hetherington, Alastair, "Failure of Intelligence Called Frightening Part of Cuban Crisis," the Washington Post, December 8, 1962, page A2, Washintgon, D.C.

47. Hightower, John M., "Kennedy Letter Praises Stevenson Role on Cuba," the Washington Evening Star, December 6, 1962, pages A–1 and A–4, Washington, D.C.

48. Hilsman, Roger, Jr., "Intelligence and Policymaking in Foreign Affairs," World Politics, V, No. 1 (October 1952), pages 2–5, 33–45. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 10, pages 5–13.

49. Hittle, Brig. Gen. James D. (U.S. Marine Corps, retired), "The Grab for Narrow Waters," Life magazine, December 21, 1962, pages 83–92, New York, N.Y.

50. Howe, Quincy, "World Press Comment," Atlas, December 1962, pages 403–409, New York, N.Y.

51. "The Influence of World Opinion," War College nonresident program, volume II, chapter 17, pages 1–2, Air University, U.S. Air Force, Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala.

52. "The Joint Chiefs of Staff," Armed Forces management, VI, No. 2 (November 1959), pages 31–34. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 7, pages 31–36.

53. Kennedy, President John F., "Interview of First 2 Years in Office," the Washington Post, December 18, 1962, page A12, Washington, D.C.

54. Kennedy, President John F., "Interview of First 2 Years in Office," the Washington Evening Star, December 18, 1962, page A10, Washington, D.C.

55. Kenworthy, E. W., "The Making of Policy," the New York Times (Aug. 6, 1961), page E9. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 4, pages 59 and 60.

56. Kilpatrick, Carroll, "Kennedy Affirms His Faith in Adlai," the Washington Post, December 6, 1962, pages A1 and A31, Washington, D.C.

57. Kilpatrick, Carroll, "Kennedy Lauds Units Poised for Cuba Duty," the Washington Post, November 27, 1962, page A2, Washington, D.C.

58. Kilpatrick, Carroll, "Kennedy on Adlai Case; Leave It to Historians," the Washington Post, December 13, 1962, page A1, Washington, D.C.

59. Kilpatrick, Carroll, "Kennedy Praises SAC After Tour of Offutt Base," the Washington Post, December 8, 1962, pages A1 and A4, Washington, D.C.

60. Kirkpatrick, Lyman B., "U.S. Intelligence," Military Review, XLI, No. 5 (May 1961), pages 18–22. Published by U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kans. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 2, pages 5–8.

61. Knebel, Fletcher, "Washington in Crisis: 154 Hours on the Brink of War," Look, December 18, 1962, pages 42–54, Des Moines, Iowa.

62. Kraar, Louis, "The Two Lives of Robert McNamara," Life, November 30, 1962, pages 94–102, New York, N.Y.

63. Lawrence, David, "How Not To Function in a Crisis," the Washington Evening Star, December 18, 1962, page A15, Washington, D.C.

64. Lawrence, David, "Khrushchev's Global Chess Game," the Washington Evening Star, November 29, 1962, page A13, Washington, D.C.

65. Lawrence, David, "Russell Sizes Up the Cuban Issue," the Washington Evening Star, December 7, 1962, page A19, Washington, D.C.

66. Lawrence, David, "Were Cuba Missiles a Hoax?" Washington Evening Star, January 2, 1963, page A23.

67. Legere, Col. Lawrence J. Jr., "Military Advice for a Strong President," Army, XI, No. 11 (June 1961), pages 22–23. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 4, pages 49–55.

68. Lincoln, Gould, "The Political Mill—Cuban Policy Hardening," the Washington Evening Star, December 4, 1962, page A–14, Washington, D.C.

69. Lippmann, Walter, "Blockade Proclaimed," the Washington Post, October 25, 1962, page A–25, Washington, D.C.

70. Lippmann, Walter, "Cuba Etched the Diplomacy of the Nuclear Age" (an address delivered by Mr. Lippmann to the Anglo-American Press Association on November 29, 1962), the Washington Post, December 2, 1962, page E–1, Washington, D.C.

71. Lucas, Jim (Scripps Howard newspapers staff writer), "A.F. Will Keep its Guard Up," The Washington Daily News, December 15, 1962, page 8, Washington, D.C.

72. Marder, Murrey, "Adlai Case Reaction—Policymakers Uneasy," the Washington Post, December 6, 1962, page A–31, Washington, D.C.

73. Marder, Murrey, "An East-West Epoch Is Ending With Cuba," the Washington Post, November 25, 1962, page E–1, Washington, D.C.

74. Morton, Louis, "National Policy and Military Strategy," the Virginia Quarterly Review, XXXVI, No. 1 (winter 1960), pages 1–17. Copyright 1960 by the Virginia Quarterly Review, University of Virginia. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 1, pages 49–56.

75. "The National Scene," the Washington Sunday Star, December 9, 1962, page B–1, Washington, D.C.

76. "National Security Council," U.S. Government Organization Manual, 1962–63, revised June 1, 1962, pages 56–57.

77. Neustadt, Richard E., "Presidential Power," pages 56, 57, 83, 84, 97, 107, 108–151, 154, 179, 205, 206, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, N.Y., 1960.

78. Nielsen, Waldemar A., "Huge, Hidden Impact of the Pentagon," the New York Times magazine (June 25, 1961), pages 9, 31, 34, 36. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 17, pages 75–80.

79. Nitze, Paul H. (Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs), "State-Defense-JCS Relations," address to the Electronic Industries Association, March 13, 1962, Washington, D.C.

80. Ogburn, Charlton, Jr., "The Formulation and Administration of U.S. Foreign Policy," appendix C to a study prepared at the

request of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations by the Brookings Institution, 86th Congress, 2d session, January 3, 1960, Study No. 9, pages 970–975.

81. "Operations Coordinating Board," U.S. Government Organization Manual, 1962–63, revised June 1, 1962, page 649.

82. "Operations Coordinating Board," U.S. Government Organization Manual, 1960–61, revised June 1, 1960, page 64.

83. "Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Relationships with the Office of the Secretary of Defense," Department of Defense Directive 5158.1, December 31, 1958, pages 1–5. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 7, pages 23–24.

84. Organizing for National Security: The Department of State, the Policy Planning Staff, and the National Security Council. Hearings before the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, 86th Congress, 2d session, June 17, 1960, part VI, pages 853–860. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 5, pages 47–52.

85. Organizing for National Security: The National Security Council and the Departments of State and Defense. Hearings before the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, 86th Congress, 2d session, June 10, 1960, part V, pages 696–701. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 5, pages 15–20.

86. Oulahan, Richard, Jr., "Step by Step in a Historic Week," Life, November 2, 1962, pages 42B, 47, 48 (see also pp. 38–41 of issue).

87. Pearson, Drew, "'Flap' Does Adlai No Good," the Washington Post, December 13, 1962, page E–11, Washington, D.C.

88. Pearson, Drew, "Inside Story on Adlai Stevenson," the Washington Post, December 12, 1962, page D–13, Washington, D.C.

89. Pearson, Drew, "Kennedy Wants Adlai To Stay," the Washington Post, December 6, 1962, page B–23, Washington, D.C.

90. Pearson, Drew, "A Pair of Power Struggles," the Washington Post, December 14, 1962, page B–11, Washington, D.C.

91. Phillips, Cabell, "Intelligence Program Faces Major Overhaul," the New York Times (Aug. 6, 1961), page E–10. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 10, pages 31–33.

92. Plesent, Stanley (General Counsel and Congressional Liaison, U.S. Information Agency), letter to Members of Congress on the role of the USIA in the Cuban crisis, November 15, 1962, Washington, D.C.

93. "Principles of Public Information Policy," Department of Defense Directive 5230.13, May 31, 1961, pages 1–2.

94. Ransom, Harry Howe, "Secret Mission in an Open Society," the New York Times magazine (May 21, 1961), pages 20, 77–79. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 10, pages 65–69.

95. Raymond, Jack, "New Air-Ground Force Slated To Start Operations," the New York Times (Oct. 13, 1961), page C–10. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 7, pages 19–20.

96. "A Record for History," Army-Navy-Air Force Journal and Register, December 8, 1962, page 11, Washington, D.C.

97. Roberts, Chalmers M., "Adlai's Cuba Crisis Role Upheld by White House," the Washington Post, December 4, 1962, pages A–1 and A–7, Washington, D.C.

98. Roberts, Chalmers M., "Charge That Stevenson Differed With Kennedy at Time of Cuban Crisis Is Flatly Denied," the Washington Post, December 3, 1962, pages A–1 and A–2, Washington, D.C.

99. Roberts, Chalmers M., "The Cuban Affair: Russian Reconnaissance in Force," the Washington Post, November 27, 1962, page A–15, Washington, D.C.

100. Roberts, Chalmers M., "The Day We Didn't Go to War," the Reporter (Sept. 14, 1954), pages 31–35.

101. Roberts, Chalmers M., "The Stevenson Flap: His Image as U.N. Partisan Damaged," the Washington Post, December 5, 1962, page A–21.

102. Rusk, Dean, "A Fresh Look at the Formulation of Foreign Policy," the Department of State Bulletin, XLIV, No. 1134 (Mar. 20, 1961), pages 395–399. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 2, pages 11–15.

103. Rusk, Dean, "An Hour With the Secretary of State," as broadcast over the CBS Television Network, November 28, 1962, New York, N.Y., pages 6–10 (transcript).

104. Rusk, Dean, "The President," Foreign Affairs, XXXVIII, No. 3 (April 1960), pages 353–369. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 4, pages 21–29.

105. Rusk, Dean, "Role of the Department of State in National Security Affairs," the Department of State Bulletin, XLV, No. 1159 (Sept. 11, 1961), pages 455–458. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 5, pages 23–25.

106. Seagrave, Sterling, "Eyes in the Sky," the Washington Post, December 9, 1962, E–5, Washington, D.C.

107. Shackford, R. H. (Scripps Howard newspapers staff writer), "George Ball Gives His Official Version of L'Affaire Stevenson," the Washington Daily News, December 14, 1962, page 1.

108. "Showdown—Backdown," Newsweek, November 5, 1962, pages 27–35, Dayton, Ohio.

109. Stanley, Timothy W., with Ransom, Harry H., "The National Security Council; The Integration of Political, Military, and Economic Factors in National Policymaking," Organizing for National Security: selected materials. Prepared for the Senate Committee on Government Operations and its Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, 86th Congress, 2d session, committee print, 1960, pages 73–88. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 2, pages 31–42.

110. Stern, Lawrence, "Adlai Affair Develops New Twist," the Washington Post, December 10, 1962, pages A–1 and A–21, Washington, D.C.

111. Taylor, Edmond, "Political Warfare: A Sword We Must Unsheathe," the Reporter, XXV, No. 4, pages 27–31. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 17, pages 83–89.

112. "Text of American Assembly's Suggestions on Foreign Policy," the New York Times (Oct. 10, 1960), page 21. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 5, pages 63–66.

113. "The Trend to Unification," Armed Forces Management, VII, No. 2 (November 1960), pages 28–29. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 7, pages 27–28.

114. "The Truth Must Be Our Guide, but Dreams Must Be Our Goals," Newsweek (Sept. 18, 1961), pages 24–28. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 17, pages 39–45.

115. "United Nations: Guardian of Peace," Department of State Publication 7225, September 1961, pages 33–37, "Listening Post of the Human Race." In WCNP, volume II, chapter 17, pages 71–72.

116. "U.S. Foreign Policy: The Formulation and Administration of U.S. Foreign Policy," a study prepared at the request of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations by the Brookings Institution, 86th Congress, 2d session, January 13, 1960, study No. 9, pages 92–96. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 10, pages 25–28.

117. "United States Had Five Divisions Set to Invade Cuba," the Washington Evening Star, November 29, 1962, pages A–1 and A–5, Washington, D.C.

118. Voss, Earl H., "United States Has Little Hope of Soviet Policy Shift," the Washington Evening Star, December 18, 1962, pages A–1 and A–6, Washington, D.C.

119. Warren, Sidney, "New Dimensions in the Presidency," Saturday Review, XLII, No. 34 (Aug. 20, 1960), pages 11–13, 40. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 4, pages 41–45.

120. "Who Really Gained in the Cuba Showdown?" U.S. News & World Report, November 12, 1962, pages 42–46.

121. "Your Department of State," Department of State Publication 7168, released May 1961 (revised), pages 4–7, 10–13. In WCNP, volume II, chapter 5, pages 5–7.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, in placing this study in the RECORD, I am not including the preface and the table of contents in the study. However, I do wish to mention that part of the preface which states:

In this connection, a disclaimer is made that, while there are marked similarities in this fictionized study to contemporary events and persons, and while such contemporary factors are used for citation purposes in the text, no living person is depicted in this study.

TRANSSHIPMENT OF WHEAT BY POLAND AND YUGOSLAVIA TO OTHER COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, some weeks ago I received a letter in which the writer stated that he had information that wheat shipped to Poland in large tankers is transloaded to other ships in the Baltic and suggesting that this wheat which comes from the United States under Public Law 480 goes behind the Iron Curtain. I have received similar reports about our Public Law 480 program in Yugoslavia.

I asked the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations to check this matter with the Department of State and I hold in my hand a letter to Mr. Marcy of the Foreign Relations Committee staff from Assistant Secretary of State Dutton. This letter is dated April 19 and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., April 19, 1963.

Mr. CARL MARCY,
Chief of Staff,
Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. MARCY: Thank you for your letter of April 11, 1963, requesting a report on the alleged transshipment of Public Law 480 wheat by Poland and Yugoslavia to other Communist countries.

The Department has received in recent months several inquiries about alleged transshipments by Poland and Yugoslavia of the Public Law 480 agricultural commodities they had received from the United States. On each of these occasions the Department made a separate check but no substantiating evidence was uncovered. Upon the receipt of your inquiry, the Department again checked all available sources of information, including intelligence sources, but again there were only negative reports. It should be noted in this regard that Poland and Yugoslavia failed to produce enough wheat last year to meet their domestic needs and were obliged to turn to foreign suppliers.

As you know, our Public Law 480 sales programs are carefully reviewed to assure that the commodities sold are well within the consumption requirements of the receiving country, will not displace normal commercial marketings of such commodities and will not result in the increased availability of those or like commodities for export to other countries. Under the terms of our Public Law 480 agreements, Poland and Yugoslavia agreed not to resell or transship to third countries Public Law 480 commodities unless specifically approved by the U.S. Government.

The Department, which maintains careful surveillance to insure compliance with the

Public Law 480 agreements, would, of course, be seriously concerned about any violation of these agreements. The record shows, however, that Yugoslavia and Poland have always lived up to their Public Law 480 commitments.

If I can be of further assistance to you in this matter, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I must say that the letter is a model of ambiguity. In short, it states that the Department has had a number of inquires about alleged transshipments of Public Law 480 commodities but that no substantiating evidence was uncovered. The letter also states that there still continue to be only negative reports, when my specific inquiry was checked against all available sources of information.

After these statements the letter contains some disarming comments about the general nature of our sales to Poland and Yugoslavia and that Poland and Yugoslavia have always lived up to their Public Law 480 commitments.

I hope the Department of State is right. I hope it will be shown that our Public Law 480 shipments to eastern Europe are models of careful management. Unless I am mistaken, however, there is enough smoke not only in the reports I have received but in the ambiguity of the Department's letter to lead me to believe that American Public Law 480 shipments are in fact getting behind the Iron Curtain. Time will tell.

PRESERVATION OF THE NATURAL BEAUTY OF OUR NATION

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, three Missouri newspapers recently published editorials in support of legislation designed to preserve the natural beauty of our Nation. The St. Joseph News Press called for the enactment of the wilderness bill which recently was approved by the Senate. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the Columbia Missourian called for the enactment of the Ozark National Rivers bill now pending in committee. Because each of these editorials points out so clearly the need for immediate action to safeguard the natural splendor of our great Nation, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch]

FOR ACTION IN THE OZARKS

Governor Dalton upheld the interest of all Americans, now and in the future, when he again urged the safeguarding of the Ozark rivers by the National Park Service. This message to the Senate subcommittee considering the appropriate legislation again added the official approval of Missouri to the pleas of Senators SYMINGTON and LONG, of Secretary of the Interior Udall and many others for a major conservation project already too long delayed.

Delay, however, is the chief hope of those who for their own reasons are in opposition. They now have shifted to a proposal for putting the Current and other Ozark rivers under State administration, based on voluntary easements which would disperse essential control among landowners rather than lodge it clearly in public lands.

Surely Congress cannot overlook the fact that because the State found the task beyond its ability, the help of Washington was sought and accepted by Governors and legislatures alike. The suggested reversal of this well-founded policy is akin to the opposition's earlier proposal to turn the rivers over to the Forest Service rather than the National Park Service. This suggests a desire for looser control—or no control at all.

To approach the near unanimity which may be politically necessary to save the rivers, concession after concession has been made to the opposition. The area of the reservation was reduced. Scenic easements were authorized. Hunting was sanctioned. Life tenures of landowners were granted. And so on. Now the opponents describe these concessions incorporated in the pending bill as weaknesses. If weaknesses they be it must be remembered at whose demand they were written into what was indeed originally a superior plan.

Those who would preserve the rivers as nearly as possible in their present, free-flowering state are moved by sincere appreciation of a natural treasure exposed to ever more damaging exploitation. In this, they continue to be reasonable. Though the national interest is overriding, respect is being shown for lesser interests. There is no threat of a roughshod raid of expropriation.

There is ample reassurance in the pending bill's provision for the establishment of an Ozark National Rivers Commission. Its seven Missouri members are to guide the Secretary of the Interior in the development and governance of the reserve. The Secretary himself is to designate one member; two are to serve on the recommendation of the Governor, and four on the recommendation of the county courts of Carter, Dent, Shannon, and Texas Counties. How much more may be asked in reason for a project which was, after all, not initiated in Washington but in Jefferson City?

We hope Congress will agree that the time has come at last for action. Governor Dalton speaks for the overwhelming majority of Missourians when he asks the National Park Service to save the Ozark streams.

[From the Columbia Missourian, Apr. 17, 1963]

OZARK PARK BILL

A bill to preserve a 94,000-acre area stretching for 140 miles along the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers in the southeastern Missouri Ozarks is attracting national attention in Washington. More than 40 persons, mostly Missourians, crowded the Senate Interior Committee session and a House subcommittee meeting recently.

The bill was proposed by Senators STUART SYMINGTON and EDWARD V. LONG and Representative RICHARD ICHORD, all of Missouri. The 94,000-acre area consists of strips along a 100-mile reach of the Current River and a 39-mile reach of the Jacks Fork River, a tributary of the Current.

The purpose of the proposed reserve is, under administration by the National Park Service, to preserve the natural beauties of the area and make it more accessible to public use for fishing, hunting, camping, hiking, and float trips on the rivers.

But the opposition to the bill charges that the Federal Government "only wants to get a foot in the door with these national rivers bills." Opponents want to turn over the rivers to the Forest Service rather than the National Park Service, and concession after concession has been made to the opposition; the area of the reservation was reduced, scenic easements were authorized, hunting was sanctioned, life tenures of landowners were granted, and so on down the line.

Supporters of the proposal have eliminated the Eleven Point River area in Oregon County and a reach of the Current River in Ripley County. The entire area now is in Representative ICHORD'S district, in Dent, Shannon, Carter, and Texas Counties.

The opponents are mostly those who own lands in the area. They are trying to satisfy their own interests.

The bill will not only preserve the beauties of the Ozarks, but it would also help rehabilitate the eastern Ozark highlands economically and biologically. It will protect the area against strip logging, dams, and slum real estate development.

The proposed bill, if passed, will eventually increase tourist visits from the present estimated 1 million to several million yearly in the near future. The tourist business now brings almost $10 million a year into the area, compared to only $2 million for farming.

It is clear that the public interest far outweighs the private interests that are in opposition. It is therefore hoped the Congress will act to safeguard the Ozark rivers by the National Park Service in the public interest.

[From the St. Joseph (Mo.) News Press, Apr. 19, 1963]

WILDERNESS AREAS

For 6 years, Congress has been considering passage of a wilderness bill. Two years ago the Senate passed such a bill, which died in the House. In those 2 years, mining and lumber companies have gobbled up quite a chunk of wilderness area and have established claims on other tracts.

As the population increases, wild areas are decreasing. There are not many spots left where one can meditate in the primitive woods, unspoiled by the hand of man.

The bill before Congress is not a drain on the Federal Treasury. Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, a cosponsor of the bill, points out that no expenditure of public money is involved. The land is already owned by the Government. The bill does, however, insure that these areas be preserved for present and future generations.

There are cultural, inspirational, recreational, and scientific values involved. There needs to be some place where a person can get away from the blare of loudspeakers, the whine of tires on the highways, the sounds of the city. This is America as our forefathers found it.

And when the areas are made safe from encroachment, we have one more hope: That we don't build a crisscross of roads through them.

FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE OF ISRAEL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I want to join with its many other friends around the world in wishing happy birthday to the State of Israel on the 15th anniversary of its founding as an independent nation.

It has been my privilege to visit Israel several times during the past two decades, and I have been amazed by the great progress which has taken place there. There has been great progress both in the development of democratic institutions and in the work of the Israelis toward making the desert bloom for the benefit of the millions who have come, and still come, to this land of promise to make a new life for themselves and their children.

As a friend of Israel, I am distressed by the recent passing of Israel's President, Mr. Ben-Zvi, and also by the fears on the part of the Israelis and their friends in this country that Israel's

security may again be threatened. But I believe, as I have always believed, that Israel will survive these and all future setbacks and perils and remain forever as a light to all men who yearn after freedom.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article from today's New York Times containing portions of anniversary messages to Israel from Mayor Wagner of New York and President Kennedy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY HAILS ISRAEL ON 15TH BIRTHDAY—MAYOR ISSUES PROCLAMATION URGING BROTHERHOOD

(By Irving Spiegel)

New York paid official tribute yesterday to Israel's 15th anniversary as a nation.

At a ceremony at City Hall Plaza, Mayor Wagner proclaimed the day as Israel Independence Day before an audience of 1,500. He urged the city's citizens to join in the celebration in harmony and brotherhood.

The anniversary, which is celebrated under the Hebrew calendar of the fifth of Iyar that fell yesterday, was tempered by the death last week of President Itzhak Ben-Zvi, of Israel.

In issuing his proclamation, Mayor Wagner read a special message from President Kennedy addressed to Acting President Kadash Luz, of Israel.

The President's message eulogized President Ben-Zvi as one who had "left his imprint on a vital and fruitful era of Israel's history; his wisdom and patience, his gentle but sure leadership were evident in every aspect of the nation's life.

In hailing Israel's splendid growth and achievement in the last 15 years, President Kennedy said that "new frontiers have been explored, a haven and a new way of life have been provided for countless thousands, and new and promising paths have been charted for the nation; we look forward with you to future proud horizons."

In answering messages, Premier David Ben-Gurion, of Israel, expressed gratification over President Kennedy's message, saying, "It gives eloquent expression to the close bonds of friendship between our two peoples."

Mr. Ben-Gurion wrote that the celebration of Israel's Independence Day "by the greatest city in the world and the city with the largest number of Jews, is a source of pride and inspiration to the people of Israel and to me personally."

With American and Israeli flags in the background, Mayor Wagner lauded Israel's economic, social, and political accomplishments of the last 15 years. He cited Israel's position as a "bastion of democracy, a bulwark of freedom" in the Middle East.

MAYOR CITES ARAB THREAT

Despite these accomplishments, the Mayor said that the existence of Israel is again being menaced. He called attention to the recent merger of Syria, Iraq, and Egypt, saying that these Arab States "apparently united, turn eyes—unfortunately full of hatred—in the direction of the tiny democracy of Israel."

The mayor's proclamation was accepted by Katriel Katz, Israel's Consul General in New York. The ceremonies opened with the playing of the "Star-Spangled Banner" and Israel's national anthem, "Hatkivah," by the department of sanitation band.

There were messages hailing Israel's anniversary. Joseph Ratner, chairman of the American Israeli Religious Cultural Society, appealed to the free world to safeguard against threats of the Arab States.

QUESTION AND REPORT PERIOD

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the proposal to establish a question-and-report period in the Senate has received enthusiastic approval in the Senate and in the press.

Last week I drew the Senate's attention to a Washington Post editorial approving the proposal to question Cabinet members on the floor of the Senate. The senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] also endorsed the proposal last week, and his name was added as a cosponsor of the resolution which would amend our rules to allow such a question period, Senate Resolution 120.

On March 12, the Johnson City Press Chronicle also editorially endorsed this idea. The Press Chronicle is a very highly respected daily newspaper which is published in Johnson City, Tenn., by Mr. Carl Jones.

The Press Chronicle editorial emphasized the fact that the Senate needs a fresh source of initiative in governmental affairs, and agreed with my idea that the Senate would obtain such initiative by means of the question-and-report period.

In recent years, we have observed the growing strength of the executive and judicial branches of this Government. I think it is very important that the legislative branch continue to grow and strengthen as an institution, so that we will maintain the equilibrium which is necessary in our system of checks and balances.

Mr. President, I am proud that the Johnson City Press Chronicle agrees with me that the question-and-report period would give the Senate fresh initiative in our governmental affairs, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed following my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE AGREE, SENATOR

Quite often we find ourselves in disagreement with Senator ESTES KEFAUVER. However, we have always been in accord with his proposal that Congress adopt a technique of the British House of Commons—the question period.

In Britain, Cabinet members appear periodically in Commons to report on their activities and answer questions from Members of Parliament. Thus there is liaison between the two branches of government.

When he was serving in the House of Representatives, KEFAUVER proposed that the question period be introduced there, but nothing came of it. Now he is asking that the Senate take the initiative.

In urging action, the Senator says: "The question period would give the Senate a fresh source of initiative in governmental affairs. It would give Senators direct and fuller information with regard to the operation of all departments—not just those supervised by their committees.

"It would also give the Cabinet members a chance to advance their proposals directly to all Members of the Senate. I think the report-and-question period would be even better suited to the Senate than it would be to the House of Representatives, because of the smaller membership and the intimate nature of it."

We agree.

And we think government would be more responsible, on both administrative and legislative levels, by adoption of this practice.

GORDON R. CLAPP

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it was with deep regret that I learned of the death this past Sunday evening of Gordon R. Clapp, former Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

He was a good and admired personal friend. He was a champion of those things in our natural and social environment that can be shaped to make a better life for all people. He was certainly a friend of the people of my State and of the six other States of the TVA area.

Gordon Clapp's greatest service to the Tennessee Valley Authority, in my opinion, was as its spirited defender against the many efforts that were made in the 1950's to dismember it. But for him, I am confident, this great experiment for the benefit of so many of our people might well have been abandoned or at least sharply curtailed. And his example was surely an inspiration for those who carried on the fight to preserve the TVA after his departure from it in 1954.

It was characteristic of Gordon Clapp that after leaving the TVA, he entered into a consulting partnership with his predecessor as TVA Chairman, Mr. David E. Lilienthal. Their organization helped to bring forth a "little TVA" in Iran and was, at Mr. Clapp's death, working on similar resource development projects in many other parts of the world.

Mr. President, many of the highlights of Mr. Clapp's full and dedicated life are outlined in an obituary appearing in today's New York Times. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD, also, an editorial of the Washington Post of May 1.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 1, 1963]

GORDON R. CLAPP, EX-TVA AID, DIES—CHAIRMAN OF AGENCY FROM 1946 TO 1954 WAS PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION EXPERT—FORMER CITY OFFICIAL—SERVED UNDER GULICK BEFORE JOINING DAVID LILIENTHAL IN CONSULTING FIRM

Gordon R. Clapp, former Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority and an authority on public administration, died Sunday evening of a heart attack in his apartment in Stewart House at 70 East 10th Street. He was 57 years old.

At his death, Mr. Clapp was president of the Development and Resources Corp., a consulting firm at 50 Broadway. Before becoming associated with David E. Lilienthal, his predecessor as TVA Chairman, in the consulting organization in 1955, Mr. Clapp had served for a little more than a year as deputy city administrator under Dr. Luther H. Gulick.

Mr. Clapp had been with the TVA from its inception in 1933 until 1954. He had been successively assistant director and then director of personnel, general manager and for the final 8 years Chairman. He was appointed Chairman when President Harry S. Truman named Mr. Lilienthal to head the Atomic Energy Commission.

When Mr. Clapp's term expired in 1954, President Dwight D. Eisenhower failed to reappoint him, and he took the city post, in which he was concerned principally with public power policy and administration. His additional assignments were described by Dr. Gulick as liaison with the department of water supply, gas and electricity and the department of health, with particular reference to water fluoridation; slum clearance and public housing, development and administration of the city's personnel system and installation of its career and salary plan.

CONDUCTED POWER STUDY

Mr. Clapp also conducted a long study of how the city could obtain power to operate its subway most efficiently and inexpensively. He reported that St. Lawrence River power might be the answer, a proposal that Robert Moses, then chairman of the State power authority, termed "fantastic."

The Development and Resources Corp. was formed in 1955 by the investment banking firm of Lazard Frères & Co., with Mr. Lilienthal as chairman and chief executive officer. One of its major projects has been a waterpower system in the Province of Khuzistan, a largely desert area in southwestern Iran. The multimillion-dollar Khuzistan project is known as Iran's Tennessee Valley Authority. Last month Mr. Clapp and Mr. Lilienthal attended dedication ceremonies of the Pahlevi Dam across the Dez River, the first major structure of 14 projected dams in the vast system.

The corporation currently has work underway in Puerto Rico, South America and West Africa, and has operated in other parts of the world.

Mr. Clapp was chairman of the United Nations Commission for Economic Survey of the Middle East in 1949. Earlier, he was a member of the President's Advisory Committee on Education from 1936 to 1939 and chairman of the committee on employe relations in public service of the civil service assembly in 1942.

CITED FOR COURAGEOUS FIGHT

In 1956, Mr. Clapp received the annual award of the New York chapter of the League of Industrial Democracy. He was cited for his "wise and courageous fight for civil liberties, racial justice, and social betterment." At the award ceremony a message from Gov. Frank G. Clement of Tennessee praised Mr. Clapp for "his contribution to the Tennessee Valley Authority and the defense potential of America's national economy."

A native of Ellsworth, Wis., Mr. Clapp graduated from Lawrence College in 1927 and received a master of arts degree from the University of Chicago. From 1927 to 1933 he was director of admissions and assistant dean of Lawrence, which awarded him an honorary doctor of laws degree in 1947.

Mr. Clapp was a trustee of the American University at Beirut, Lebanon, and a member of the American University at Beirut. He had been editor in chief of The Public Administration Review and was the author of "The TVA: An Approach to the Development of a Region."

The book contains six lectures Mr. Clapp gave at the University of Chicago on the world's largest integrated electric power system.

Surviving are his widow, the former Mary Chase Peek; two sons, Rufus Carvel and Gordon Russell Clapp; three brothers, Newell, Norman and Carvel Clapp, and two grandchildren. Norman Clapp is Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 1, 1963]

GORDON R. CLAPP

Almost all of Gordon Clapp's crowded, productive life was devoted to public service in the areas of conservation and resource development. He was in the great tradition of the American pioneer—a pursuer of horizons and an opener of frontiers. For 20 years, from its very beginning, he played a vital role in the growth of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the last 8 of them as its chairman. His imagination and zeal contributed invaluably to the effectiveness of that beneficient agency in reinvigorating, enriching and democratizing a great region of the United States. When he left the TVA in 1954, he served for a short while as deputy city administrator of New York and then became president of the Development and Resources Corp., a private concern with wide interests in the promotion of progress in far parts of the earth.

Gordon Clapp combined the best qualities of the educator and the entrepreneur. He was a man of learning with much theoretical knowledge who had at the same time a knack for getting things done. He believed deeply in the best values of democracy and applied them wherever he worked so that individual freedom and improved race relations and social advancement were byproducts of his efforts to promote economic development. His untimely death at 57 is a heavy loss to a nation which has grown to greatness on the basis of just such qualities and capacities.

THE GRAIN TRADE IN A CHANGING WORLD

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, recently there has come to my attention a thoughtful address by Mr. Michel Fribourg entitled "The Grain Trade in a Changing World." Mr. Fribourg, president of the Continental Grain Co., has had a wealth of experience in the field to which he addresses his remarks. I am confident that the Members of Congress will find his thoughts on this important problem of great interest. I ask unanimous consent that his address before the Grain and Feed Dealers National Association meeting in New Orleans on March 14 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GRAIN TRADE IN A CHANGING WORLD

(By Michel Fribourg)

Gentlemen, I consider it a great privilege and an honor, to address you today at your annual convention. The subject I have selected: "The Grain Trade in a Changing World" is broad in scope. What are the general political and economic trends, which will affect agriculture in the future? Can a dynamic grain trade adapt itself to changing conditions and evolve positive programs for action? We are all interested in these vital questions. I will try to give you certain thoughts I have which will serve as guidelines. I don't profess any particular insight into these difficult problems, nor do I claim to have all the answers. You may challenge my ideas, though some of them will only be proven right or wrong in the passing of time.

Let's first take a look at the major trends in our American agriculture. They are all familiar to you:

1. The trend toward larger farms—mostly family farms.

2. Toward fewer farmers, and

3. The movement from the farms to the cities.

This is nothing new: the number of farms has been declining for over 40 years and the elimination has been mostly in the group of small marginal farmers.

An adjustment in agriculture is taking place faster than many have been willing to admit. Those able to adjust have been moving out of farming. The older, less flexible small operators have remained on the farms but, as they disappear, they are not being replaced, and their farms are being absorbed into the larger ones.

Government programs will gradually lose their importance. These programs have been aimed at assisting adjustments in agriculture without undue hardship to farmers. We are in complete agreement with this objective. I believe, however, that we are achieving adjustments at a rapid rate. In time, it will become unnecessary to protect the marginal farmer who derives his main income from his small farm. Even with the artificial supports he is getting today, he has a hard time making a living simply because he does not produce enough. Therefore, as regrettable as it may seem, he cannot survive economically and will disappear in the long run. As a result, and as our Nation becomes more urban, public opinion will not allow Congress to grant large subsidies to larger and more wealthy farmers. Lawmakers are likely to become increasingly critical of programs which increase Treasury expenditures and increase food costs.

It may seem optimistic to anticipate a reduction in the importance of Government programs in agriculture at a time when there is considerable pressure from some quarters for more Government controls on price, production, and marketing. But I would not be surprised to see a turn in the other direction sooner than one might imagine.

We will, of course, have a transition period when it will still be necessary to provide some income assistance to the marginal farmer. During this time, I believe the soundest approach to the problem is the one of direct payments to farmers. Congress and the Department of Agriculture, at the suggestion and with the approval of the grain trade, have adopted this method for the 1963–64 corn crop. They should be complimented for putting into application this completely new program for grain, which will provide substantial saving to the Government, give a fair return to farmers, and lower prices to consumers. By allowing a free flow of all corn production through marketing channels, the grain trade will be able to accomplish its normal function in the most economical fashion. I am strongly in favor of extending this system to other farm commodities, and first of all to wheat, as I believe it offers many more attractive features than the certificate plan.

If we get a shift to fewer controls—and I have no doubt that this will happen—it will mean that price supports will be gradually reduced, resulting in lower grain prices. American agriculture and the grain trade will have to adjust to this situation. This adjustment can be made without unnecessary hardships. We can foresee new scientific and technological advances which will enable farmers to sell more bushels per acre. As productivity is increased, per bushel costs of production will decrease. Farmers, though receiving lower prices, will still have fair returns and consumers will be paying less.

It is becoming increasingly apparent (and the more successful farmers have recognized this for a long time) that farming is a business, not merely a way of life. Farmers have acted as successful businessmen. They have increased their size of business by use of more capital and have devised means of cutting cost.

The entire agricultural industry has been adjusting to change. In the urbanization of our society, the population growth has been primarily in the coastal regions, which were already food deficit areas. Processing of food, including the feeding of beef and production

of poultry, is tending to be located near the population centers rather than close to the sources of feed. This reduces costs and improves service to consumers. More grain is being fed than ever before, but a smaller proportion on the farm where produced. In the 1961 crop year, less than 60 percent of the corn raised in the United States was fed on the farms as compared with over 75 percent 20 years ago. Besides, a much larger share of our grain production is now being exported than was the case only a few years ago. In other words, more grain, in both absolute and relative terms, is moving from farms. This means that more grain will have to be transported over longer distances. There will be more opportunities for us, as it will bring an expansion in our volume of trade, but it will also require some major adjustments in our country and terminal elevator investments. Some locations and types of elevators will become obsolete—some already have—but new challenges will also bring rewards to the farsighted operators.

In line with these trends, it will become increasingly important that the grain trade move its products at the cheapest possible cost. One of the great areas for innovation and change in our grain industry will be in the field of transportation. As you all know, transportation of grains is undergoing a rapid evolution. For years, Government regulations limited the ability of railroads to adjust their rate structure to meet changes and competition. This had the effect of reducing rail traffic of bulk commodities to the benefit of freer truck and water movements. We, in the grain trade, have taken full advantage of these cheaper types of transportation.

President Kennedy's message on transportation completely reversed previous Government policy. The President proposes the removal of minimum rail rate controls. This move will give the railroad an equal opportunity to compete with the other modes of transportation. As advocates of competitive free enterprise, we should wholeheartedly endorse the President's policy. And yet, a great number of industries, including many in the grain trade are fighting for maintenance of historic rate patterns. In many cases they have opposed rate reductions. This attitude may be attributed to any of the following reasons: to the fear of losing certain short-range benefits; to a concern that sharp rate reductions might create general chaos; to a lowering of profits through increased competition; or even simply a resistance to any change. Whatever the causes are, I just cannot, on such a vital issue as this, agree to a position that is in flagrant contradiction with the basic objectives we are all pursuing. We should not compromise on the question of competitive free enterprise. We, as Continental Grain, fully support the liberalization of rail rates. We are in favor of the cheapest transportation costs that will help increase the price to the farmer and reduce it to the consumer. This is one of our main functions and we cannot afford to sidetrack this challenge.

With lower grain prices and lower transportation costs, I am of the opinion that we can substantially increase our food consumption beyond the normal increase which takes place with population growth.

Although nearly everyone in the United States receives enough or even too many calories, many do not have the kind of diets they want or need. American consumers, acting in a free market, have demonstrated they want more meat and less starchy foods. Moreover, they want to substitute more beef for other meats. In our country, few people, if any, cannot afford as much bread as they wish, but many have to restrict the amount of beef they eat. Is it too much to expect that beef be available without undue sacrifices to all consumers? The point is that it takes eight times more grain to produce a pound of beef than a pound of bread. It takes three time more grain to produce a pound of beef than a pound of frying chicken. And, it takes twice as much grain to produce a pound of beef than a pound of pork. We, in the grain trade, can assist in increasing beef production and usage of grain by reducing grain marketing costs.

Optimistic as I am on the possibility of increasing usage of grain in the United States, we must also expand our exports. A hard road lies ahead of us, as we see the immediate picture; however, tremendous opportunities will develop. It will not be a one-way street. Many countries lack dollars to buy the grain they want. Others are trying to protect their own grain farmers by high import duties. However, solutions will be found. I believe we are only at the threshold of our potential growth in volume of exports. Having the cheapest and most abundant source of supply facing an underfed and increasing world population, how can U.S. grain exports fail to increase?

Great political, social, and economic changes are occurring on the international scene. I emphasize these three aspects, because there is a tendency to view them separately, whereas in my mind, they cannot be disassociated. Political and social considerations influence economic reality and vice versa. I am specifically thinking of the trend toward integration of nations, the decline of colonialism, and the creation of new independent nations, and the struggle between the Communist and non-Communist blocs.

The emergence of the European Common Market raises many differing opinions as to the future of U.S. grain exports to this important dollar area. There are two schools of thought on the subject. Pessimists believe the Common Market will move toward self-sufficiency and thereby reduce imports of U.S. products. Optimists believe that the Common Market will increase the standard of living in the member countries to such proportions that they will substantially boost imports of our farm products.

I believe the situation is somewhat different for wheat than for coarse grains. If the ultimate support price in the Community is set high, it will stimulate production and severely curtail our exports of filler wheats. If the support is set low, we can look forward to a satisfactory movement for several years.

As to coarse grains, production in the Common Market will increase, but demand will increase even more, especially if support prices are set low. Therefore, the key is the level of price supports and our Government officials have rightly stressed the need for low prices in the Community. But, "We should practice what we preach." We must, therefore, first lower our prices to the consumer at home and set the example for others to follow.

American agriculture has gone through a very difficult period over the last 15 years, but we now see a possibility that we might find some solutions to our problems. Europe's trends are similar to the ones I have described in our own agriculture, only they are—with the exception of production per acre—at the point we were 20 to 30 years ago. Europe is unaware of what burdensome grain stocks mean. We should urge her to learn from our past mistakes and benefit from our experiences. The sooner she realizes the folly of high support prices and all their consequences, the better off will she be, and so will we.

I would now like to dispel what I believe are some misconceptions about the European Common Market. First of all, I hear and read everywhere about the new levy system which has been set up and creates a tariff wall around the Six. The only thing new is the name levy and the fact that the levy is uniform for all countries. For years, there have been import taxes on grains in Belgium, Holland, and Germany. The major difference is that today, European wheat has a price advantage of $1 per ton within the Common Market, compared with imported wheat of the same quality, and that this advantage may be increased as the integration proceeds. This affects us only in our soft wheat exports. Most of the wheat we sell to Europe is the hard variety type which is not in direct competition with soft European wheats.

We are disturbed, and rightly so, by the idea that Europe wants to build a protectionist community. But let's be realistic about this. The European Common Market wants to become an integrated economic union. By gradual steps, they will equalize the different price supports of each of the members of the Community until, by 1970, there will be one price and complete freedom of trade within the Market. Is this not logical? We have this same freedom within our own frontiers. If this is to be achieved, and our foreign policy has backed this integration since the end of World War II, we will have to get used to the idea, as the Europeans will have to, themselves, of thinking not of France, or Germany, or Holland as separate entities, but of Europe, if not as yet politically united, at least economically. And then, we will come to understand that certain restrictions from outside competition might become necessary within that free trading area. After all, could we conceive, in our own country, free entry of all grains without giving some protection to our farmers? We do have import tariffs on some grains, quotas on others, and even prohibition of imports on some agricultural products, and yet, surely we do not consider ourselves as a protectionist country.

Recent developments, highlighted by the refusal of General de Gaulle to let Great Britain enter the Common Market at this stage, and his concept of a "Europe for the Europeans" appears surely as a major setback for the Western World and for President Kennedy's grand design of the Atlantic Community. Without doubt it came as a great shock to all of us. This situation might be with us for quite some time, but I am convinced that, eventually, the Atlantic Community will become a reality. It will just take longer than its original creators anticipated. "Rome was not built in a day."

As Jean Monnet of France, the "father of the Common Market," said a few months ago, speaking about the future relationship of the United States with the European Economic Community: "America, which has always taken its decisions alone, must now take its decisions in consultation with others. The Common Market countries have had to learn this. Now America is beginning to learn it. In the years ahead," he goes on, "I think America's greatest psychological problem—far greater than any material one—will be in adapting to this new relationship with Europe and the world."

The integration of the European economic bloc is still very far from being completed. and it may need to be strengthened further before it can take on new responsibilities.

I have just returned a few days ago from Paris. My observations are that De Gaulle's position has retarded economic and political integration in Europe. Talking to people from the different European countries, I was amazed at the strong nationalistic feelings which have emerged again, in France as well as in all other five countries of the Common Market. Whereas enthusiasm over the possibilities of European integration had relegated national sentiment to second place, Britain's exclusion from the Community and De Gaulle's bid for leadership and domination of Europe in close association with Germany, has stirred up again all the reservations and balance-of-power arguments, which had remained dormant.

Europe can become an economic and political entity only if each nation is willing to give up some of its prerogatives for the benefit of all and forget old ideas of supremacy. Principles of equality and give-and-take have to prevail if the Community is ever to become a reality. A crisis has arisen, which is serious. It will surely slow down the integration process, but most people believe that, in time, it will be surmounted: Europe is too deeply committed to the Common Market today. The great unknown remains: Who will be the young leaders of tomorrow and what attitudes will they adopt, as older statesmen gradually disappear from the political scene?

We may be disappointed for political and defense reasons that Britain has not yet been accepted into the Common Market. From our own agricultural point of view, we many find it a welcome development. A closer association can be developed between Britain and the Commonwealth. The British market for grain will remain open to us with few or no tariff barriers. This probably would not have been the case, had Britain entered the Common Market under complete European terms.

Furthermore, as long as Britain stays out of the Common Market, the Scandinavian countries will hesitate to join it. If, on the other hand, Spain and Portugal could be induced to enter into some kind of economic association with us, we would be retaining some of our major grain customers in Europe. An expanded European Free Trade Association could yet become viable. We would then be able to face the European Economic Community with a position of greater strength than we can today. Our bargaining power would be enhanced immeasurably for further negotiations toward the more complete integration of the two economic blocs into a true Atlantic Community.

We are deeply concerned with the prospects for grain exports to Western Europe. This area, along with Japan and a few other developed countries, provide the outlet for our sales in convertible currencies. Such sales account for about 60 percent of our exports of agricultural products. These are the type of sales which aid our balance of payments and contribute to the economic progress of our Nation.

But today, a great part of our grain exports are being made under special programs, primarily to the developing countries. These are concessional sales and donations. Payments are made in a variety of ways: local, nonconvertible currencies, barter, and long-term credits. In any event, they imply smaller dollar earnings to the United States than commercial sales. This is particularly true when one considers that most of the local currencies are loaned, or given to the recipient countries for economic development.

Political and social factors have dominated our thinking in our foreign policy toward developing countries, and I believe this is fully justified. From a humanitarian point of view, we have taken the position that poverty has to be eliminated and that the undernourishment, which is still prevalent today, of the great majority of the people in those areas, must disappear. We are committed to the raising of the standard of living in the world. This is our most potent economic weapon in our struggle with the Communist bloc, and, if this can be achieved, then our chances of ultimate success are substantial.

But these special programs, with all their attractive features, are not the complete answer to these problems. Recipient countries have a certain reluctance to receive aid, with the indirect political implications they see connected with it. It does not achieve one of the most important aims of these less developed countries: the expansion of their export trade, vital for their development and growth in living standards. After all, the countries which we refer to as underdeveloped, earn between $30 and $40 billion a year from foreign trade. This is 6 to 8 times as much as the $5 billion they receive in foreign aid. For them trade is aid. If we can help them increase their dollar earnings through exports, we will also be helping ourselves. We are sellers as well as buyers in the international markets, and the amount we sell is directly affected by the level of development in our customers: compare Holland, to which we export goods for a value of $52 per inhabitant, with India, which buys 69 cents worth per inhabitant.

We are no longer in a position, with our international deficits and loss of gold to squander our resources. We need to produce as many dollars as possible through the sale of our agricultural products. We have had some success in this endeavor. After the war large scale Marshall plan aid was provided to a financially insolvent Europe. This helped build up Europe which became a dollar buyer. More recently the same has been true of Japan and now of Spain. However through maintaining aid where it is most needed I feel we could switch more rapidly to dollar sales of our grains in some of the developing countries.

If we are to export our grain to developing countries for dollars we must give them an opportunity to earn dollars. It is a simple economic fact that if a nation wants to export it must import. I would like to propose the following plan to aid developing countries increase their dollar earning power. In addition to paying the world price for specified goods which we import from the developing countries the United States might consider paying them a certain over-price. This over-price would be variable with fluctuation in the world market but would guarantee developing countries a certain minimum price. The widest over-price premium would be paid when world markets are most depressed and none would be paid above a certain world price level. The over-price premiums should be set aside and applied partly to the purchase of U.S. grains and partly to the purchase of U.S. industrial goods.

I realize this plan may be against some of the principles of GATT, but these and other differences could be worked out. Such a scheme would, of course, be a subsidy to developing countries; in fact, we would be giving direct payments for the production of some goods in specified countries. This would have certain definite advantages to both the United States and the developing countries. The United States would receive some dollar earnings from our grain sales. It would enable our nonagricultural industries to sell more manufactured goods. This could prove a competitive advantage, when the developing countries take their place as regular dollar buyers. By temporarily paying higher than world prices for certain materials from these developing countries, we would help stabilize their economies. Prices they would receive from the export of their goods would not be subjected to sharp world market fluctuations. At the same time, the foreign producer, not getting the direct benefit from this increased price, would not be encouraged to expand production beyond the normal world demand.

I believe a system of subsidy or over-price such as I have discussed, is preferable to a widely recommended scheme of international commodity agreements. I base this on observations of the actual operations of the International Wheat Agreement. International commodity agreements can work only when they make economic sense to all participants. As now conceived, I consider their value extremely limited as stabilizers of world prices, and not likely to be very binding on quantity guarantees, whenever they are put to a test for any of these reasons. Besides, they allow those countries which do not participate, to increase their share of the market at the expense of those countries which abide by the rules. This has been the case for the Eastern bloc countries which, until recently, stayed out of the International Wheat Agreement. Would it be conceivable for the International Wheat Agreement to survive, if prices remained for an extended period of time at the high or low range, without any changes being made? Great Britain was a member after the war, when there were severe shortages, but refused to continue in 1953 when it no longer appeared advantageous.

It would be similarly unthinkable that an importing country, if it became self-sufficient, would continue to take its import quota indefinitely. Within a very broad framework, these agreements can have some value, but mostly, I believe, as a forum for countries to discuss mutual problems, to learn from the experiences, good or bad, of one another, and to reach certain understandings of a technical nature.

A most important accomplishment could be to develop close cooperation on providing aid programs for the developing countries.

This is somewhat in line with one of the objectives of the so-called Baumgartner proposal. An ex-Governor of the Bank of France and an outstanding financier, Mr. Baumgartner has evolved a plan for worldwide commodity agreements, which has had the full backing of the French Government. He has devised an ingenious concept, and on the surface, makes it appear as if it solved both our agricultural problems created by the Common Market agricultural policy, and our international balance of payments.

The basic provision of the Baumgartner plan is an agreement between major wheat producers (he takes wheat as a first step) and the Common Market countries to increase the world export price of wheat to the level of the European support price. This theory could have considerable appeal, but, in reality, it has many flaws. I cannot go over all of them, but I can point out that it cannot guarantee a flow of imports by third countries, as quantitative guarantees are excluded by the Rome Treaty. He justifies his high European price support as the world price through the concept that this world price should be based on the highest cost of production of the marginal farmer. We surely cannot condone inefficiency and believe that such a price, on the contrary, should come as close as possible to the cost of production of the most efficient farmer. His attractive price feature is the incentive offered to the United States, to go along with the high support prices to be established in the European Common Market.

This is contrary to our thinking. In our opinion world prices should be low, in order to expand consumer demand and discourage artificial production in areas not suited for low cost growing crops.

I have mentioned to you some of the changes, on the national as well as on the international scene, which can have a major impact on the grain trade in the years to come. On some of these, we have an opportunity to influence the outcome; others are beyond our control. But in all cases, we will have to adapt, to create, and to form a united front. We are in business to render a service at a profit. We must continuously find new ways of providing our services more efficiently, and at less cost. We are the link between the farmers and the food consumers. We must see to it that the majority of the farmers get an equitable income, and that the consumers pay as little as possible for their products. I believe low prices determined in free competitive markets to be an essential element in the development of free grain exchanges, and in the expansion of international trade. I believe no system has

been evolved that can replace advantageously the basic laws of supply and demand.

On international policies I would like to quote Federal Reserve Board Chairman William Martin, in a speech he made recently. He replied to certain critics who accused him of putting too much stress on the balance of our international payments, and to others of concentrating too much on domestic goals. Here was his answer: "Both criticisms overlook what seems to me an obvious fact; namely, that our domestic and international objectives are inextricably interrelated. We simply do not have the choice of pursuing one, to the virtual exclusion of the other. Both must be achieved together, or we risk achieving neither."

I fully endorse this type of thinking. We cannot disassociate our domestic from our international policies in grain.

We, in the grain trade, have to form a united front in helping shape Government agricultural and trade policies. I realize that many different interests are involved, and that certain changes can benefit or harm one more than another. Yet, in the last analysis, each one of us has to consider what is best for all from the long range point of view. Temporary hardships can be surmounted, but compromises on basic objectives could lead to the severe weakening of the private grain trade. However, I am sure we can unite and achieve a bright future for the grain trade.

AIR FORCE—REPORTED SHORTAGE IN GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on September 8, 1961, I received a report concerning an alleged shortage in Government property which had been furnished to the Air Mod Division, Cook Electric Co., in connection with its contract for maintenance overhaul of C–124 Globemaster aircraft at Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Del.

This information was forwarded to the General Accounting Office; and under date of January 15, 1963, I received a reply confirming that inventory differences representing shortages of some items aggregating $340,500 and overages of other items aggregating $203,800 had been discovered. This represented a net shortage of $136,700.

According to the report from the Comptroller General, in June 1962, the Air Force had accepted the contractor's offer of $25,000 in settlement of this reported inventory difference.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter of the Comptroller General of January 15, 1963, as addressed to me, and a second letter signed by Mr. Hassell B. Bell, Associate Director of the General Accounting Office, as addressed to the Secretary of the Air Force, be printed at this point in the RECORD. These letters outline in greater detail the circumstances concerning these shortages and the settlement thereof.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., January 15, 1963.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Reference is made to your letter of September 8, 1961, which contained information concerning an alleged shortage of $250,000 in Government property furnished the Air Mod Division, Cook Electric Co., in connection with its contract for maintenance overhaul of C–124 Globemaster aircraft at Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Del.

On the basis of the information furnished in your letter we began a review during October 1961 of the contract records maintained at the Air Force Contract Management Office, Dover Air Force Base, and interviewed Mr. Kreisher as suggested in your letter. Mr. Kreisher advised us that his knowledge of the matter was based only on rumors he had overheard. Since the Air Force was then in the process of investigating these shortages, which represent the value of Government property on the contractor's stock records that could not be located or otherwise accounted for at the time the inventory count was made, we deferred further examination until the Air Force and the contractor reached agreement on the amount of the settlement.

Our examination, which was resumed on August 6, 1962, disclosed that no final and conclusive determination with respect to actual shortages and overages can be made from an examination of the contract records. Neither the contractor nor the Air Force personnel responsible for contract administration were able to satisfactorily explain the shortages and overages except by reference to inadequate records and the contentions of the contractor. However, the Air Force, in negotiations with the contractor, agreed to accept a settlement of $25,000 for the reported shortages.

Since no final determination can be made as to the extent of actual loss to the Government from the records made available for our examination, we have requested the Secretary of the Air Force to comment on the reasonableness of the negotiated settlement. A copy of this letter is enclosed for your information, and we will furnish you a copy of the Air Force reply when it is received.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE,
Washington, D.C., January 15, 1963.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE.

Attention: Mr. J. J. McLaughlin, administrative assistant.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The General Accounting Office has examined the settlement negotiated between the Department of the Air Force and Cook Electric Co., Air Mod Division, Morton Grove, Ill., for shortages in Government property furnished the contractor under the fiscal year 1961 contract for maintenance overhaul of C–124 aircraft at Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Del. The shortages represent the value of Government property on the contractor's stock records which could not be located or otherwise accounted for at the time the inventory count was made in July 1961. The inventory count was taken for the purpose of transferring the responsibility for Government property from Air Mod to Hayes International Corp. which was awarded the fiscal year 1962 maintenance overhaul contract.

At the time we began our review in October 1961, the Air Force was in the process of investigating these differences prior to negotiating a final settlement with the contractor. We deferred further examination until the settlement had been completed. In June 1962, the Air Force accepted the contractor's offer of $25,000 in settlement of the reported inventory differences representing shortages of some items of $340,500 and overages of other items of $203,800 or a net shortage of $136,700. Our examination, which was resumed on August 6, 1962, included a review of pertinent contract records at the Air Force Contract Management District, Philadelphia, Pa., at the Air Force Contract Management Office, Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Del., and at Cook Electric Co., Air Mod Division, Morton Grove, Ill.

Negotiated fixed-price contract AF 04(607)–5122, dated July 8, 1960, was awarded to the Air Mod Division of the Cook Electric Co., Morton Grove, Ill., by the Air Force Logistics Command, Warner Robins Air Materiel Area, Robins Air Force Base, Ga. This contract, which covered fiscal year 1961, was the last of four consecutive annual contracts awarded to the Air Mod Division for the maintenance overhaul of C–124 Globemaster aircraft under the progressive aircraft reconditioning cycle concept. The preceding three maintenance overhaul contracts awarded to the Air Mod Division were cost-type contracts. The subsequent contract, for fiscal year 1962, was competitively awarded to the Hayes International Corp. All contract maintenance work performed at Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Del., is administered by the Eastern Contract Management Region, Philadelphia Contract Management District, Dover Contract Management Office, under the Air Force Systems Command.

Pursuant to the general provisions of contract AF 04(607)–5122, the Government was obligated to furnish certain parts and materials which would be required in the performance of the contract. The parts furnished to the contractor are classified, as follows: Category I, "Hi-Valu" items which are subject to special control procedures; category II, property having a unit value in excess of $9.99; and category III, property having a unit value less than $9.99. Additionally, as a separate category of property, the contractor was furnished tools and equipment for use during contract performance. We found that during November 1960 the Air Force property administrator approved the contractor's material control procedures.

According to Air Force records there were no unusual property losses reported by the contractor in performing the first two contracts covering the period from July 1957 to June 1959. In February 1960, before the completion of the third contract, the contractor was directed to make a complete inventory count of all parts and material excluding tools and equipment. This count disclosed the actual inventory was $13,000 less than the contractor's recorded inventory, comprising shortages of $17,100 for some items and overages of $4,100 for other items. The Air Force relieved the contractor of responsibility for the shortage because no facts supporting contractor negligence could be established. This inventory count was accepted by the Air Force and the official records for Government-furnished property were adjusted as of June 1, 1960, for the net shortage of $13,000.

Upon completion of the fourth and last contract, AF 04(607)–5122, an inventory count of Government-furnished property in the possession of the Air Mod Division was taken prior to transfer of this property to Hayes International Corp., the successful bidder for the fiscal year 1962 maintenance contract. The Air Force, Air Mod Division, and Hayes International Corp. personnel participated in the inventory count. A comparison of the inventory count with the contractor's stock record card balances, including those for tools and equipment, showed property shortages of about $552,000 for some items and overages of about $191,000 for other items, or a net shortage of about $361,000.

Subsequently, the contractor conducted a comprehensive review and analysis of 39 high dollar value items. The contractor informed the Air Force on September 22, 1961, that the results of its detailed review, if projected over the entire inventory, showed a net overage of about $10,500 for all classes of property except tools and equipment. This presentation was not accepted by the

Air Force and the contractor agreed to make another review of its inventory records based solely on receipt and issue data. As a result of this latter examination, the contractor reported shortages of $340,500 on some items and overages of $203,800 on other items, and requested that relief from liability for the net shortage of $136,700 be granted. The contractor reported also that the differences were caused by incorrect balances on the stock record cards resulting from errors in posting, errors in documentation, erroneous channeling of supporting documents, and other administrative errors. The contractor contended that the property generally was applicable only to C–124 type aircraft. The contractor stated that any possible shortage could be attributable to the failure of the Government to furnish adequate storage and security facilities to properly store and control the property, and to the use of maintenance repair shops by both Government and contractor personnel.

On the basis of a limited review of stock record cards and in recognition of the various arguments presented by the contractor, the Air Force concluded, after negotiations with the contractor, that $25,000 would be a fair and equitable settlement for the net inventory shortage. In general, the Air Force concluded that a detailed analysis of each item was not feasible and that consideration of selected representative items showed that the actual losses sustained by the Government were, at best, but a small fraction of the shortages indicated by the contractor's records. Furthermore, the Air Force recognized that it contributed in some small part to the poor condition of the records.

Our review of Air Force records showed that during the period of the contract no formal complaints were made by the contractor to support its contention that the Air Force contributed to the shortage by failing to furnish adequate storage and security facilities to safeguard the property and by allowing the maintenance repair shops to be used by both Air Force and contractor personnel.

Our review of the stock record cards maintained by the contractor disclosed (1) inconsistencies in posting transactions, (2) erroneous postings from transaction documents, (3) pencil corrections and notations which could not be explained, and (4) inadequate documentation of receipts and issues. Because of these conditions, the entries on the stock record cards cannot be accepted as a reliable account of property transactions and accountability under the contract. Therefore, no final and conclusive determination with respect to actual inventory shortages and overages can be made from an examination of the contract records. Neither the contractor nor the Air Force personnel contacted in our review were able to satisfactorily explain the shortages and overages except by reference to inadequate records and the contentions of the contractor. However, in negotiations with the contractor, the Air Force has agreed to accept a settlement of $25,000 for the reported shortages.

Since no final determination can be made as to the extent of actual loss to the Government from the records made available for our examination, we would appreciate your comments as to the reasonableness of the settlement and advice as to the current status of the settlement and actions taken to prevent a recurrence of this condition. Copies of this letter are being sent to the commander, Air Force Logistics Command, to the commander, Air Force Systems Command, and to the commander, Eastern Contract Management Region, for their information.

Sincerely yours,

HASSELL B. BELL,
Associate Director.

A RADIO FREQUENCY BAND FOR RADIO ASTRONOMICAL RESEARCH

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly today about a matter which—to the best of my knowledge at least—has not been discussed before this body previously. Yet, in my opinion, even though it is a matter primarily within the area of responsibility of a regulatory agency, it is a matter of great concern to the Congress of the United States, since it concerns the future effectiveness of our space research program.

The matter to which I refer has to do with the possible Federal protection, through the Federal Communications Commission, of a radio frequency band for radio astronomical research. I understand that earlier it had been hoped that the Federal Communications Commission would provide some solid protection for such a channel—but recent developments now indicate that this may not be the case and that some limited commercial operations on the frequency may now be allowed.

According to my information, these limited commercial operations, which could occur on channel 37, would be of very serious detriment to the entire program of the U.S. observations of distant objects in space. The FCC, through a ruling—docket 15022, RM–180—has proposed, for 5 years, to limit operation in this channel to a particular geographical area of the United States. However, they have proposed also to license some commercial stations in New Jersey. If commercial television operations are carried on in this channel anywhere in the United States, it will seriously harm research progress.

It is not essential that channel 37 in particular be free, but it is essential that a free channel be preserved very close to this frequency and 37 is the best choice. There is already a fair amount of international agreement to keep this particular channel open, and it is necessary that the same channel be open on a worldwide basis. Moreover, it seems that this channel is probably the best prospect now available for protection in the United States. It is not sufficient for research purposes that there are clear channels in different parts of the frequency spectrum, because some important astronomical objects have strong energies in this range, and we will be seriously limited if there is not an available channel in approximately every octave of the radio frequency spectrum, including this one.

If the channel is protected for radio astronomy, it will mean the loss of conventional TV broadcasting on only one channel of approximately 69 of the TV spectrum.

It is my personal conviction that national interest and particularly, the wide public interest in research in astronomy and space physics, genuinely supports giving full, unrestricted, and worldwide protection to this channel. Obviously, the FCC can only control the U.S. participation in clearance of the frequency, but our example would go far toward establishing a world agreement on the matter. I cannot emphasize too strongly, that the proposed limits of protection suggested by the FCC are inadequate, and represent a threat to what will otherwise be a crucially significant "window" to radio exploration of space.

It may seem incongruous to some, in light of my established position as being in firm opposition to increasing governmental controls, for me to take to the floor of this body, now urging such a regulatory control. However, if any to whom it might seem incongruous, will take the trouble to look a little deeper, I think it will be most obvious why I am doing so.

There is one area above all where political philosophy must be put aside in order to protect the best interests of the most people—the area of basic space research. I think all who know me will agree that in my work on the Appropriations Committee, I have always taken the position that this is one area where this Nation must surge ahead with all possible practical speed in order that we may fully prepare ourselves for the space age into which we are now entered.

Because I am so firmly convinced that we should let nothing stand in the way of continuing progress in the field of the space sciences, I have written the distinguished chairmen of the Senate Committees on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and Commerce, urging that these committees give serious consideration, if such is consistent with the policies and the thoughts of the committees as a whole, to recommending to the Federal Communications Commission that some action be taken as quickly as possible to provide such protected facilities for the benefit of our space research program. I urge my colleagues in the Senate to join with me in calling for action on the part of the FCC in this matter, which is so vital to our space research program.

Additionally, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD additional substantive information in the form of a letter from a very dear friend of mine, Dr. Walter Orr Roberts, of the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colo., which he directed recently to Chairman Minow of the Federal Communications Commission; and a draft of the comments on FCC docket 15022, RM–180 by Dr. G. C. McVittie and Dr. G. W. Swenson, Jr., of the University of Illinois Observatory in Urbana, Ill.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 22, 1963.

Mr. NEWTON N. MINOW,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MINOW: You have given, I know, careful consideration to the proposed FCC ruling (Docket 15022, RM–180) in respect to the use of TV channel 37 and the needs of radio astronomy. I am sure that there are many arguments for opening this frequency band to TV broadcasting, and I am keenly aware that nature has made things difficult by providing so limited a spectrum range suitable for this service.

However, I believe that the Commission has perhaps not fully recognized the degree to

which national interest requires giving full unrestricted and worldwide protection to this channel for scientific research purposes. Even the FCC's proposed limits on the use of the channel represents a threat to this small but crucially significant "window" to space.

The general public will, I am certain, concur with radio astronomers in support for this unique window to the cosmos, and will be fully prepared to make the necessary sacrifice of 1 additional channel among the 50 or more available for conventional television services, as important as these are. Consequently, I hope you will continue your study of this critically important question until a clear decision is reached on the public interest. If the channel is lost for research purposes, I believe that science will be significantly harmed, and that we who are responsible to protect the broad interests of the public will to this extent have failed to provide responsible stewardship of a crucial natural resource.

In making these comments I am speaking as Director of the National Center for Atmospheric Research. NCAR is a basic research laboratory created jointly by 14 universities in response to the recommendation of the National Academy of Sciences. It is sponsored by the National Science Foundation and exists to promote broad national interest in respect to research in the atmospheric sciences.

I am available at any time to amplify my comments to you or your colleagues on the Commission if it will help in reaching a sound decision, and would like very much to call on you personally about this matter. I believe ample technical justification is already in the Commission's hands or abundantly available from the National Academy of Sciences.

You will undoubtedly also hear from the National Radio Astronomy Observatory about this matter. Their role in respect to radio astronomy is similar to ours in respect to atmospheric sciences, and both of us are concerned regarding the protection of channel 37. Please let me know if I can assist in providing further details to you in documenting the research need for this channel.

Very sincerely yours,

WALTER ORR ROBERTS.

DRAFT COMMENTS ON FCC DOCKET 15022, RM–180

(Prepared by Dr. G. C. McVittie and Dr. G. W. Swenson, Jr., for Mr. Wm. A. Porter, the university's legal counsel for frequency protection matters)

Comments on sections 4 and 5: Attention is drawn to the phrase "* * * public interest questions raised by the conflicting needs of television broadcasting and radio astronomy with respect to channel 37."

The Commission does not mention the existence of any evidence that the public has demanded more UHF television channels. Indeed the actions (December 1962 and January 1963) of the city of Danville, Ill., of the County Board of Supervisors of Vermilion County, Ill., and of the Senate of the State of Illinois in petitioning the FCC for the allocation of 608–614 Mc/s to the radio astronomy service, show that the opposite is the case. When the public is apprised of the conflicting needs of television and of radio astronomy, the American public is apparently quite ready to give up one of the UHF television channels for the needs of a branch of space science.

The Commission cites the example of Paterson, N.J., as a city where no alternative to the use of channel 37 is possible.

Again there is no reference to any evidence that the citizens of Paterson, N.J., are dissatisfied with the number of television channels which now serve them. This is hardly surprising since Paterson, N.J. lies 15 miles from the center of Manhattan and the New York area is already served by seven television channels.

Comments on sections b(C) and 9:

The Commission wishes to restrict discussion to the 608–614 Mc/s band (sec. 9) but nevertheless itself refers to the protection accorded to the band 404–410 Mc/s in regions 2 and 3 and to 406–410 Mc/s in region 1 (sec. 6(C)). The conclusion might be drawn that since the latter bands are protected in the critical part of the frequency spectrum below 1000 Mc/s, protection at 608–614 Mc/s is unnecessary. This is to misunderstand the nature of the radio astronomy problem: a clear band is needed roughly in every octave below 1400 Mc/s. It should also be stated for the completeness of the record that the draft proposals of the United States for the next ITU Conference (Doc. 6975/4–4.4/3.1.16 Ref. Doc. 6134/2–4.4) contains the proposal to delete the protection accorded to 404–410 Mc/s and thus remove what has been described by European radio astronomers as "this precious asset" accorded to radio astronomy at Geneva in 1959. The precious asset is to be replaced by an unsatisfactory secondary allocation at 328.6–335.4 Mc/s.

Comments on section 10: I. Two general comments are necessary, the first of which refers to the function of a large telescope. Whether the instrument is an optical one or a radio telescope, it is usually built with a definite initial observing program in mind. This initial program, in the case of the University of Illinois radio telescope, is the compilation of a catalog of positions and of flux densities of extragalactic radio sources as described in section 6(A). But this does not mean that, on the termination of the initial program, the instrument ceases to have any use. On the completion of our catalog, it will undoubtedly be necessary to study individual sources further; the addition of a second relatively small radio telescope would turn the 600 by 400 foot parabolic cylinder into a powerful interferometer, with which data on the angular diameters of radio sources could be obtained; studies of the moon and of the planets of the solar system can be undertaken, and so on. The analogy with the (optical) 48-inch Schmidt telescope at Palomar Mountain is useful here. This instrument was built with the National Geographic-Mount Palomar Sky Atlas project in mind. When the Sky Atlas was completed, the 48-inch Schmidt was not dismantled and abandoned as a research tool. It has continued to be used in a variety of research programs in optical astronomy (reports of the director, Mount Wilson and Palomar Observatories). Similarly the 600 by 400 foot parabolic cylinder radio telescope of the University of Illinois is not an ephemeral project which will be abandoned after 5 years. It is the start of a radio astronomy observatory of permanent value, provided, of course, that radio astronomy is permitted to continue on earth. And this continuation is dependent on freedom from interference by manmade radio noise.

The second comment is that nearly all the significant work to date on distant extragalactic radio sources has been done at frequencies below 1000 megacycles. The reason is not far to seek: these sources radiate the more powerfully, the lower the radio frequency. At 1400 megacycles and above their radiation is so weak that only a few of the strongest ones have been studied by these means.

Answers to questions A to F of section 10:

1. The initial observing program (catalog of extragalactic radio sources) ideally requires observations to be made for 24 hours a day for 365 days a year. The obstacles to attaining this ideal are of two kinds (a) natural, (b) man made. These will operate in the following ways:

(a) (i) Presence of the sun on or near the meridian. The sun's radiation at 608–614 megacycles is so powerful as to obliterate the signals from extragalactic sources. (ii) High winds, ice storms, sonwstorms. In these conditions access to the trusses carrying the antennas is dangerous to personnel. Setting the antennas—which has to be done manually—will be impossible in these conditions.

(b) Manmade radio signals from terrestrial radio transmitters, those in satellites, etc., can obliterate the signals from extragalactic radio sources.

2. Initial program: Completion of a catalog of accurate positions and flux densities of extragalactic radio sources. The period of 5 years for the completion of this program quoted in section 7 implied that from 12 to 16 hours a day, free of radio interference, will be available. Sec. 8 suggests that there may be as few as 4 hours a day free of interference under the plan proposed by the FCC. Thus the period for the completion of the initial program could be extended to 15 or 20 years. This is only another way of saying that without proper protection from manmade interference, radio astronomy is in practice impossible.

Later programs: Since the operation of a radio astronomy observatory is a continuing process, it can be anticipated that the initial program will be followed by observing programs of the general types outlined in (I) above. Therefore, there is no foreseeable end to the work of the University of Illinois Vermilion River Observatory any more than there is to the activity of the Mount Wilson and Palomar Observatory or to that of the National Radio Astronomy Observatory.

3. The results of the initial program are expected to be—(a) Better positions than are now available for extragalactic radio sources.

(b) As a consequence of (a), and of the simultaneous measurements of the flux densities of the sources, new and important information regarding the nature of the universe will be obtained. This is because it is highly probable that many of the radio sources are very remote. The rate of increase of numbers of radio sources with decreasing average flux density is an important criterion for identifying the kind of universe in which we live and so of solving the problem of the exact nature of the expansion of the universe.

(c) As a second consequence of (a), the optical identification of extragalactic radio sources will be facilitated. This then permits the study in both the optical and the radio domains, of these exceptional objects. In spite of the work being done at other radio astronomy observatories in the world, at frequencies other than 611 megacycles, the problem of identification is still far from a solution.

(d) The observations will fix one more point on the radio spectrum of each radio source in the important region below 1,000 megacycles. These radio spectra provide one means of identifying the character of the radio emission of galaxies and should ultimately help to explain why one galaxy is an emitter of radio waves while another is not.

The later programs are expected to throw further light on the possible variability of certain extragalactic radio sources, their angular diameters, composite structure, etc. The nature of the emission at 611 Mc/s of the moon and the planets of the solar system would add to the information about the physical characteristics of these bodies.

The exploration of every new field of science necessarily yields results that cannot be foreseen in advance. If such foresight were possible, the exploration would be superfluous. Radio astronomy is leading to new discoveries every day, just as optical

astronomy has been doing for the past 2,000 years and still continues to do today.

4. This question appears to be based on the presupposition that radio astronomical observations are so few in number that observing programs can be switched from one instrument to another without a serious net loss in the amount of information obtained. This is as untrue in the radio domain as it is in the optical. The 200-inch telescope at Mount Palomar can do all that the new 120-inch telescope at the Lick Observatory in California can. The existence of both instruments, however, more than doubles the rate at which information can be acquired. The 300-ft. dish at the National Radio Astronomy Observatory, with a collecting area of some 71,000 sq. ft., is the nearest approach to a survey type instrument like that of the University of Illinois. It would be as absurd to suggest that the observing program of the 300-foot dish be abandoned in favor of those of the Illinois instrument, as it would be to propose that the program of the 120-inch telescope at Lick should be stopped in order to take over the work of the Mount Palomar 200-inch.

The answer to question 4 is therefore that there is no alternative instrument in the United States.

It would be equally pertinent to inquire if there were alternative television transmitters in the New Jersey area which could be received in Paterson.

5. The broader the bandwidth is, the more sensitive is the instrument. The sensitivity varies as the square root of the bandwidth. Therefore, the widest possible band should be provided; in no case less than 5 megacycles/second.

6. Mr. Robert F. Kirby of the Central Radio Propagation Laboratory of the National Bureau of Standards has prepared a report entitled "Potential Interference from UHF Television Channel 37 to the Radio Astronomy Service," February 5, 1963. This computations show that the signal from a Channel 37 TV transmitter on the Empire State Building with effective radiated power of 202 kw, would produce a signal at the antenna output terminals of the University of Illinois Radio Telescope of 191 decibels below one milliwatt approximately 5 percent of the time, through the mechanism of tropospheric scattering. This is within the detection capability of the radio telescope and would result in nearly as many spurious sources as real sources being recorded. A transmitter 365 feet high, in Paterson, N.J., with an E.R.P. of 242 kw would produce a similar effect.

Mr. Kirby's computation of the power received by reflection from the moon, for the situation in which the moon is on the horizon of a transmitting station at Paterson, N.J., and randomly oriented with respect to a radio telescope, shows that the power received by the telescope is 222 decibels below 1 milliwatt. This is not considered to be a threat to the University of Illinois program. Further computations, assuming the moon to be randomly oriented with respect to the transmitter and in the main beam of the radio telescope, show a very strong level of interference, namely 163 decibels below 1 milliwatt. One of the programs planned for the Vermilion River Observatory is a series of measurements of the moon's radiation at 610 megacycles; this measurement would be impossible under the conditions of interference described.

Satellites such as Echo (100-foot balloon) are not expected to pose a serious problem because of their rapid motion.

CONCLUSIONS

I. Radio astronomy at 611 megacycles per second has a foreseeable lifetime far longer than 5 years. The University of Illinois radio telescope will thus continue to be used after January 1, 1968.

II. The protection accorded to this instrument by the Commission's proposal is a useful interim measure. But the answer to question F above indicates that many reruns over portions of the sky would be needed in order to distinguish between real sources and the spurious ones due to radio interference. Thus the time needed to complete the initial program would be increased by an unforeseeable amount.

The Commission's proposal is not the final answer to the protection problem for the University of Illinois instrument, or for the continuance of radio astronomy in the United States. The appropriate answer is the reservation of 608–614 megacycles per second for the radio astronomy service throughout the country.

III. If the conclusion of item (II) above is accepted, the granting of licenses for commercial television to operators outside the 600 miles radius will create vested interests that will make the evenutal clearance of 608–614 megacycles per second more difficult.

Attention is drawn to the fact that the Commission mentions no evidence in favor of the proposition that the American public, either in Paterson, N.J. or elsewhere, has demanded that broadcasting on channel 37 be instituted.

METCALF DOESN'T DODGE IN ANSWERING QUESTIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Independent Record of Helena, Mont., there appears an article by Robert E. Miller entitled "METCALF Doesn't Dodge in Answering Questions." It refers to our distinguished colleague and my close associate in matters of concern to our State and the Nation, the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. Miller's article is in the nature of a report on Senator METCALF's frank exchanges with members of the Helena Chamber of Commerce on various issues of the day. It is an excellent report which emphasizes the Senator's characteristics of courageous honesty, straightforward approach, sound knowledge, and deep dedication to the interests of the people of Montana and the Nation. These are, indeed, the characteristics which have served to raise LEE METCALF to such high esteem in the Senate in the relatively short time that he has been in this body.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article previously referred to be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISSUE OF THE DAY—METCALF DOESN'T DODGE IN ANSWERING QUESTIONS

(By Robert E. Miller)

Senator LEE METCALF, who addressed the Helena Chamber of Commerce dinner the other evening and concluded his talk by answering a series of questions, left no one in doubt about where he stands on several controversial issues.

On one or two questions he confessed to a lack of information and on some he protested that the subject was too broad to be covered in so brief a time.

On one or two he assured his listeners that he stood with them and would do what he can to advance the purposes enunciated by the chamber of commerce.

One of these had to do with the reorganization of the Helena office of the Internal Revenue Service. He said that he had met with local employees of the office concerning possible reassignments and had been assured that Secretary Dillon will soon announce a new reorganization plan.

"We are not convinced," he said of himself and Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, "that the proposed plan will save money, but we think it will cost jobs and service in Montana."

On another question he also gave the answer that was expected of him.

SMELTER ISSUE

That concerned the East Helena smelter and the issue of whether the import quota of lead ore from South Africa will be transferred to another nation so that imports will remain at the present level and no plants need be closed.

He brought his hearers up to date on one aspect, which is that the Tariff Commission has already ruled that the quota cannot be transferred, that an appeal is being taken and the President will be asked to decide.

But, he warned, the American Mining Congress is split on the issue because some of the big American mining concerns are backers of the South African smelter and they want to import its product to this country.

MORE INDUSTRIES

When he was asked how Montana might attract more industries he confessed that if he knew that answer he would go into the business of attracting industries.

But he pointed out that Montana has two things which are in its favor, first, the brainpower developed at such institutions as Montana State College which is reflected in Montronics, the new electronics industry in Bozeman, and second, its falling water, which might be transformed into cheap power as was done at Hungry Horse Dam to develop the aluminum industry at Columbia Falls.

On Federal aid to education, he revealed that he has not modified his opinion.

"I am convinced," he said, "that the people of America can no longer stand high property taxes needed to care for their educational systems and that we need to supplement this with Federal assistance."

He pointed out that in his opinion the Federal funds for impacted areas are Federal aid, as is the National Defense Education Act. He has had no expression of opposition to this, he said, except from Governor Babcock.

GENERAL ACT NEEDED

"A general act that would spend the same amount of money as these two programs," he said, "would be the cheapest, most beneficial and would take care of Federal activities in the field of education without Federal control."

Concerning the issue of depletion allowances to the oil and mining industries, he charged that his point of view has been distorted by the press.

Depletion allowances for the mining industry, he said, provides for its lifeblood in western Montana. He pointed out that this is a method whereby the government avoids the taxation of capital and said that whether it is 27 percent or 31 percent for oil and 15 or 17 percent for mining is only a numbers game. The important thing is that the program be continued.

One method of improving the depletion allowance, he said, would be to apply it before income is figured so that it would benefit low-profit mining operations, such as those at Butte.

Senator METCALF asserted that he would vote for Federal aid to private colleges, but not for Federal aid to private elementary and secondary schools.

He said that the private colleges, such as Carroll, are making significant and vital contributions to progress and research in this country.

"I differentiate on a historical and traditional basis between contributions to private elementary and secondary schools and

contributions to higher education so far as the Government is concerned," he said. "I would vote only for Federal aid to public elementary and secondary schools."

Concerning a pending bill on unemployment compensation, he said that there should be as much States rights and as much State control as possible, but that he does not know exactly what the bill provides.

TAX REFORM

He said that he believes the reform provisions of the proposed tax reduction bill will not be enacted, but that he favors the President's tax proposals which provide for a deficit for the next 3 fiscal years in order to stimulate the economy by a tax reduction that he believes would eventually produce more revenue.

Not all of the questions were controversial, but certainly those on Federal aid to education, Federal aid to private schools, the depletion allowances, cheap electrical power at Government expense, and deficit spending are issues on which he could not have expected unanimity from his audience.

THE MASS TRANSPORTATION BILL

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on April 4, 1963, this body, by a margin of only 11 votes, passed S. 6, known as the mass transportation bill. I vigorously opposed the bill in both committee and on the floor of the Senate. The bill is now pending before the House of Representatives.

Since the Senate passed the bill, there have come to my attention some interesting and revealing comments on the subject matter; one in the form of an editorial appearing April 9, 1963, in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat newspaper, and another in a letter addressed to me by a constituent, whose name I have been requested not to reveal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and the letter referred to be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Apr. 9, 1963]

MR. KENNEDY'S MASS TRANSPORTATION SCHEME: A GOLD-PLATED TAX DRAIN

The first administration victory in this session of Congress was a brand New Frontier pork barrel, gilded with multimillion-dollar hoops. The Senate voted 52 to 41 last week for the President's mass transportation measure.

This program got its fledging start 2 years ago, when the Housing Act of 1961 afforded $50 million loan authority, for studying city transit problems and suggesting solutions. Like so many Federal bureaucracy babies, this one grew as fast as a toadstool.

No longer does the big-spend camel poke its nose in the Government's fiscal tent. It bursts in like a rhino, ripping budget walls, mouth wide in hunger for giveaways from Washington's deficit finance.

This year the administration wanted $500 million to subsidize mass transportation in cities, by grants and loans. This was scaled down, by a specious amendment, to $375 million.

But it would cost Uncle Sam $6 to $10 billion, if Federal Government meets its share of handling mass transit in the United States, as visualized under this scheme.

Here is a gold-plated drain for taxpayers' money that could make TVA look like a power puddle ditch and knock the stuffing out of budgets for decades to come.

The problem of mass transportation in the Nation's cities is difficult and pretty general. But it most certainly should be a local function, as other city facilities are a local function.

If Federal bureaucracy continues to usurp State and local duties, with thick slices of easy subsidy, there can be no end but bankruptcy for the national Government.

It is impossible to justify endowing mass transportation in 26 major cities, or more, at a cost to every taxpayer in the land. It is illogical and wrong, for instance, to tax farmers in Missouri for St. Louis' failure to solve its transit problem.

* * * * *

There is absolutely no question but that public transit systems of large cities, in many cases, are having a hard time. Mass transportation has been a declining industry since general automobile usage—except for the war years. Some kind of rapid transit may be an answer.

It is not clear yet that subsidies generally are essential. But if they do prove necessary they should be a clear public obligation of local areas, not of debt-ridden Big Brother in Washington.

The House should kill the Senate mass transportation measure and balk this new venture into tax prodigality.

The national welfare cannot require a tiff digger outstate or a cow puncher in Wyoming to pay for mass transportation in St. Louis.

Congress should dump this pork barrel before it starts to roll the country into further, soaring deficits.

Hon. FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: Thank you very much for sending the records of the transit hearings. I have read virtually every page.

I have noticed several stellar attempts at managing the facts by the protransit lobby.

Several times it was mentioned that 3 miles of freeway in Cleveland cost a terrible $70 million. What they didn't mention is that these are the 3 downtown miles, including the giant innerbelt bridge across the Cuyahoga Valley. This is not ordinary highway construction. They have been using this Cleveland example for months, even in national advertising, without mentioning the true facts.

A downtown subway for rails in Cleveland was estimated at $35 million for an approximate mile, which is more costly than the $70 million figure for 3 miles of roadway. There will be plenty of costly rapid transit projects in this program.

I noticed the Boston & Maine experiment included, and being pronounced a success. But nobody mentioned how many autos it took off the street during the congested rush hour. The gains they speak of come all across the clock, and from—as mentioned—competing buslines.

For instance, the Erie Railroad in Cleveland has 1 train into Cleveland daily that picks up 12 passengers at the Lee Road Station. If we got Government money, and added 3 or 4 trains during the day, and picked up another 12 passengers, that would be a 100-percent increase. And the added passengers did not come out of rush-hour traffic anyway. All figures are clouded so one cannot tell what rush-hour traffic was picked up (prime point of the proposed subsidies) and did it come from auto or the competing buslines?

Here is a control that is desperately needed on the bill, or else the Government will have no check as to the results of grants.

If you can get someone in the House to add a rider to the bill making it mandatory to receivers of loans to submit ride counts on all lines on the respective systems annually, with severe penalties if this is not done, we will be able to see the results of the transit legislation.

This, FRANK, is necessary. Let me give you an example.

The Windermere rapid transit station in Cleveland has been losing riders for the past few years. It is impossible to attract any new auto business to it, and the new Lakeland Freeway has opened to the Euclid area.

With all the national attention beamed on rapid transits, CTS cannot afford to have the Windermere rapid transit station losing riders. So what did they do, effective this weekend? They took off all through buses from downtown Cleveland to Euclid Beach Park on the Lake Shore express on all runs, except during rush hours.

This means that if you stand in front of Euclid Beach Park, Villa Angela, Beulah Beach, the only bus you can get is one that takes you across town, ignoring the new freeway, to Windermere rapid transit depot. Running time is now 45 minutes instead of 22 minutes, but with all the kids and families going to Euclid Beach this summer, this will boost the Windermere station counts.

And I can hear it now in Washington at some future hearing. "In Cleveland, when the Lakeland Freeway was opened, our rapid transit in Cleveland gained riders at the nearest rapid station—Windermere."

That is why it is necessary to keep counts following grants on all routes, a system run to see if they gained any new riders, or if it is just bus diversion. Virtually any gain made on the CTS rapid has been caused by eliminating or diverting buses, not autos to clear up congestion.

Another example of trying to divert bus passengers from the freeways: CTS already charges 5 cents more on the Lake Shore express bus than the rapid, on the basis that it is a fast ride. The other day they were going to establish four stops on East 185th Street so that these citizens could get a fast ride downtown over the new Lakeland Freeway. CTS management wanted another 5-cent premium, or a 40-cent fare to ride buses on the freeway, against 30 cents on the rapid transit.

If you are at St. Clair Avenue and Nottingham Road today, you can't get a bus downtown over the new Lakeland Freeway (a 17-minute run to East Third and Superior), but instead buses at that point carry you to Windermere Station for a 45- to 50-minute ride downtown, another example of diversion.

I realize that you have waged a tremendous battle, FRANK, and after reading the records, it was a very trying and fierce one. History books are going to record those who had foresight, against a wave of votes that tried to re-create an age of 50 years ago in big cities. It was like voting subsidies to horse buggy manufacturers when the autos came out.

Thanks for everything, and if you can pass the word to make them responsible by furnishing ride counts as part of Federal law, we'll have something.

Sincerely,

THE WESTERN CHOICE IN EAST-CENTRAL EUROPE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, there have been a number of suggestions in the press in recent weeks that the United States is deemphasizing, and perhaps even planning to abandon its commitment to the ultimate liberation of the captive peoples of Central Europe. Among other things, the press has reported that the funds available for the refugee political groupings, with whom we have heretofore been working, have been sharply curtailed.

I hope that these reports are in error or at the least exaggerated, because I can conceive of no more deadly blow to the cause of freedom or to our national security than the formal abandonment of the captive peoples. This fact is frequently forgotten; but the captive peoples of Europe, so long as the hope of liberation remains alive, have constituted one of the main deterrents to Soviet aggression and, in this sense, have protected the peace.

Of all the refugee political organizations in this country the Assembly of Captive European Nations is unquestionably the best known and most effective. The assembly has recently issued a memorandum entitled "The Western Choice in East-Central Europe." In this memorandum the assembly points out that—

A Western policy which would not aim beyond stabilization would prompt a bolder Soviet bid for the mastery of Europe, for the simple reason that it would suppress one of the deterrents to a reckless policy of intimidation: the spirit of resistance in East-Central Europe. Paradoxically enough, then, to achieve stability, the West must aim beyond stability to a Europe united in its natural confines.

Mr. President, I consider the memorandum of the Assembly of Captive European Nations to be a document of great significance and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point, in the hope that all of my colleagues will give it the attention it deserves.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WESTERN CHOICE IN EAST-CENTRAL EUROPE—A MEMORANDUM

At a time of decision for Western civilization and the entire cause of freedom, it is incumbent upon the Assembly of Captive European Nations to affirm, once again, its conviction that (1) the struggle for Europe, the decisive arena in the global contest between freedom and communism, is far from being over; (2) the people of East-Central Europe are apt to play a very significant role in this struggle; (3) durable and secure peace will remain unattainable as long as Soviet power will be left in control of the geographic center of Europe; (4) to serve both the short- and long-term requirements of a free Europe, moral and political obligation and self-interest equally enjoin the Western Powers to voice and demonstrate by meaningful political action their vital stake in the freedom of the Eastern half of Europe, as well as their steadfast resolve to help, by all legitimate means, the captive peoples recover the exercise of their right of self-determination.

The validity of these views was increasingly confirmed in the last 2 years. Western policy has, nevertheless, tended to move away from them. It has, in fact, been inclined to downgrade, if not to discount altogether, the beneficial impact of an active Western support of the freedom yearnings of the captive peoples upon the outcome of the continuing struggle for the freedom of Europe. Its favorite assumption seems to be that Western restraint generates Soviet moderation, and both beget stability in Europe. Hence, accommodation with the Communist regimes is not only the "realistic" course, but the only way in which the West could extend its influence to the ultimate benefit of the people concerned.

These clearly discernible trends call for more than a reaffirmation of deeply held convictions. They demand (I) an examination of both Western views and current misconceptions on East-Central Europe; (II) a presentation of the views of the assembly on the present stakes of the West in the same area, and (III) an outline of specific measures designed to promote the vital common interests of the Western Powers and their allies in East-Central Europe. This is, indeed, what this memorandum attempts to do.

I

Fairness commands that the examination of Western views on and policies toward East-Central Europe be prefaced by the statement that it is in the legislative bodies of the Western nations, the U.S. Congress above all, and in such international parliamentary assemblies as the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe and the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, that the issue of the freedom of the captive nations receives nowadays the greatest attention and the most outspoken support. It is in such bodies that the purpose of an East-Central Europe—free from outside domination and living under institutions and governments freely chosen by the respective peoples—is most consistently upheld. It is in these respected bodies that practical policies incompatible with the proclaimed purpose find few advocates or supporters.

In the absence of a common policy in the framework of NATO, there is, in the West, on the executive governmental level, a wide range of positions in regard to East-Central Europe. Three major trends deserve examination.

The first, as set forth in authoritative U.S. statements,[1] correctly notes that despite changes in the direction of more internal autonomy, "Soviet military power remains the ultimate force that sustains the power and authority of the Communist minorities, guarantees the continued existence of the regimes, and prevents any national defection from the Soviet bloc." In line with this basic assessment of the situation, the U.S. objective is defined as "to see in Eastern Europe fully independent nations enjoying internal freedom and normal relations with all countries." The expectations are, however, very sober. Because of Soviet domination "any far-reaching change, involving a rollback of Soviet control, is unlikely at an early date," and, except in the event of unforeseen developments, "progress toward the U.S. long-term objective" in Eastern Europe "appears realizable only by gradual means." Extension of U.S. and Western influences "by maintaining and developing more normal and active relations with the Eastern European governments of the Soviet bloc"—is declared to be the practical policy. This is to be pursued to the extent possible to do so without, at the same time, sacrificing basic American principles, "without endorsing the internal and foreign policies of the governments, or accepting or implying that we (i.e., the U.S. Government) accept in any way the status quo of Soviet domination as a satisfactory or permanent condition of affairs in that area."

This neatly balanced definition of goals and means, and sober assessment of future outlook presents one basic flaw. Experience indicates, indeed, that any progress on the road to more active relations with the Eastern European governments is likely to be paid by silence on the ultimate goal ("silence is consent" is an old saying the Russians like to quote when it serves their purpose); by the elimination from the agenda of the United Nations of the one fragment of East European subjugation with which the world Organization is concerned, the question of Hungary which might be an "irritant to the Soviet rulers but is a stimulant to the captive peoples; by subdued information programs; in short, by actions of commission or omission conveying to the people most concerned the depressing message of the acceptance of the status quo.

There seems to be some misconceptions at the root of this attempt to reconcile ends and means which in practice, if not in theory, are mutually exclusive. One is the belief that direct contacts—personal, cultural, economic, through governmental channels are the sine qua non of Western influence with both regimes and peoples. The fact that contacts are but minor means of carrying influence is overlooked. In a situation like the one prevailing in Eastern Europe, the choice of the carrier itself would preclude any positive influence upon peoples profoundly, if mostly silently, hostile to the regimes. As to the ruling groups, it would be self-deceptive to expect that regimes perfectly aware of their utter dependence on Soviet power could be tempted to help engineer their own doom. The main point is that influence is not a function of contacts but rather of the message the West can give to the captive peoples. To the extent to which it succeeds in projecting itself as strong, determined and winning, and to the extent it also cares to identify itself with the goal of the captive peoples, it exercises a stimulating influence on the people and a restraining influence on their unchosen rulers. Conversely, eagerness to develop official contacts is viewed as a sign of weakness. It breeds contempt among the ruling groups and discouragement among the broad masses of the people.

It follows that the pursuit of contact and gradual ameliorations can only be reconciled with the proclaimed goal of freedom and independence, if this goal is never drowned in silence but, on the contrary, is frequently and authoritatively voiced and pursued by meaningful, if not immediately effective, political actions. Past experience would indicate, however, that such efforts at reconciliation are fraught with so many practical difficulties that the prospects of accomplishing them successfully for any length of time appear very dim.

The second trend, quite widespread in Europe, is to regard the issue of Soviet imperialism at the expense of the captive nations as a convenient point of rebuttal whenever Soviet "anticolonialism" displays an excessively cynical form in international assemblies. In this view, the issue of the freedom of the eastern half of Europe is a long-range moral problem; it has ceased to belong to practical politics. The Communist regimes and the status quo of the captive nations' subordination to Moscow are accepted as realities which neither the peoples concerned nor the West is prepared or able to change fundamentally. Contacts and trading with these regimes are viewed as matters of expediency and national interest, and are all the more welcomed as they are deemed to contribute to the evolution of the Communist regimes toward more humane and rational ways.

Lastly, a third trend averts a direct confrontation with the problem of the captive nations by holding out the more far-reaching prospect of a continental system stretching from the Atlantic to the Urals. It rests on a rather sanguine conception of the power of Communist China and the threat it would represent for the Soviet Union.

In spite of being so different, the aforementioned trends rest on a number of closely related, if not common, premises, assumptions, and judgments. They bear a closer review.

1. "The situation in Europe is stabilized and can only be changed at the prohibitive price of war"—is more often than not the

[1] Particularly in the most comprehensive recent statement of U.S. policy on the captive nations, the statement of the Honorable William R. Tyler, Assistant Secretary for European Affairs, Department of State, before the Subcommittee on Europe of the U.S. House of Representatives, on Sept. 13, 1962.

fundamental premise of the opponents of an active east-central European policy.

This proposition fails to pass any closer scrutiny. The Soviet Union is as intent as ever to gain further ground in Europe and its rulers believe that they could succeed in this without war, by intimidation and a crisis strategy.

For more than 3 years they have been pursuing this strategy by stirring up the Berlin crisis on the calculation that sooner or later, when faced with a clear-cut choice between risking all or accepting Soviet terms, the West will yield. This, Moscow expects, would undermine the credibility of American guarantee and induce a gradual breakdown of the Western alliances. The fact that a halt was called to this offensive, following the Cuban miscalculation, might only indicate that, before probing again or pushing to a showdown, Moscow wants to complete the buildup of its military potential and certain specific armament programs, bring some order in the Communist house, and in the process, confusion and complacency among its opponents.

A Western policy which would not aim beyond stabilization would prompt a bolder Soviet bid for the mastery of Europe, for the simple reason that it would suppress one of the deterrents to a reckless policy of intimidation: The spirit of resistance in East-Central Europe. Paradoxically enough then, to achieve stability, the West must aim beyond stability to a Europe united in its natural confines.

2. By denouncing the coexistence policy of Khrushchev—one often hears—Communist China has certified the genuineness of this policy.

In fact, Khrushchev himself has called coexistence a form of struggle for the achievement of the ultimate Communist goal. The program adopted at the XXII Party Congress leaves no doubt that for Moscow peaceful coexistence is—in the words of an American authority on Soviet affairs—"a prolonged contest in which it must exert its full strength and will in order to make decisive gains by all means short of nuclear war."

3. Since liberation of East-Central Europe is only possible by some kind of military action, it is said, and since the United States and its allies do not contemplate any such action—it would be irresponsible to represent freedom and independence for the captive nations as an objective of American or Western policy.

Commitment to a purpose is in itself a political action productive of far-reaching effects. The Communists have always recognized and acted upon this truth. Their strength lies precisely in their ability to bring about change in their favor by means short of all-out war. To accept the theory that an area or a people once taken over by communism are beyond recovery by similar means is to admit defeat in advance.

4. It is claimed that Eastern Europe is in the midst of a process of relaxation of terror and gradual liberalization. The process would be disturbed by a Western insistence of maximal goals. It could be, on the contrary, furthered by Western aid and an expanded Western program of contacts, trade, and cultural exchanges.

To begin with, it would be much more correct to speak in terms of relaxation of repression than in terms of liberalization. The changes which have occurred in East-Central Europe since the death of Stalin represent essentially a lessening of irrational and unnecessary terror. They are not changes in the nature of the totalitarian dictatorships, or in the nature of the relationship with the Soviet Union.

These relaxations of repression, varying in degree from country to country, occurred in the past and are likely to appear again in three circumstances:

(a) Uncertainty in regard to the real source of ultimate authority in Moscow, with the ensuing caution and vacillation on all echelons of power. This was the case during the struggle for power in the Kremlin, following Stalin's death.

(b) Communist fear of a general uprising at a particularly inauspicious time. This was the case of Poland, in October 1956, and it caused a substantial tactical retreat on the part of the Communist regime.

(c) Confidence among the ruling groups deriving from international developments favorable to the Soviet Union and from a mood of dejection among their subjects.

The first two of these circumstances were certainly not products of Western aid, credits, contacts or good will. They were the result of a combination of internal and external pressures. As for the third circumstance in which some relaxation occurred in the past, discouragement among the ruled and confidence among the rulers, this certainly involved Western responsibilities. But these were not of a sort that warrant any satisfaction. For discouragement means more security for Soviet Russia and, hence, a bolder Soviet policy toward its main target: Western Europe.

Economic aid, it must be conceded, could at best help in preserving some of the gains secured by popular pressure in a country like Poland, providing, however, that the respective regime is kept aware that any further encroachment on the very limited rights and liberties the Polish people recovered in 1956 would bring about the termination of aid.

A recent report of the Special Study Mission of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, rightly remarks that "the Western European countries tend to look at the Soviet bloc mainly as a market for their exports—while the Communists regard the West primarily as a source of essential goods." "Western exports of capital goods enable the bloc"—continues the report—"to telescope technological progress in various fields." "The Soviet bloc derives greater benefit from this trade than do the countries of free Europe"—concluded the report. The Western Powers seem to be set to pursue such trade. If so, in the light of these findings, they should at least avail themselves of their powerful bargaining position. They do not have to help the expansion of the Communist warmaking machine by credits. And they could use their position to induce an increase in the production of consumer goods. They could even avail themselves of their important economic bargaining power to wrest political concessions that would directly benefit the people in the captive lands. Then, indeed, they could lay claim to a real contribution to the welfare of these people.

II

The Western stake in East-Central Europe derives from the strategic location of the area, from the increment Soviet power is now drawing from the manpower and resources of the region, as well as from the historic incompatibility between Soviet aims and the interests and aspirations of its ancient nations.

East-Central Europe—half a million square miles and 100 million people strong—lies between the Soviet Union proper and free Western Europe. It is the place where the very centers of power of the two contending camps stand in close, direct and decisive confrontation. Just beyond it lie prime strategic goals: westward—free Europe, the great concentration of skills and resources, which is, in the Communist strategy plan, a decisive way station in their drive for world conquest: eastward—the very heart of the Soviet Union. Within this area live historic nations—hostile to the foreign rule and alien pattern of life foisted upon them, nations which yearn to live in freedom and have, therefore, strong reasons to obstruct the Soviets and help the West. From the point of view of manpower and production, East-Central Europe represents a 40 percent increment to the economic power of the Soviet Union.

From the short-range point of view, East-Central Europe may play a decisive role in thwarting the present Soviet strategy of gradual expansion by political means, into the Western half of the old continent. Once this objective is achieved, East-Central Europe would become the area in which the West can accomplish the most significant strategic gains. It is the place where a United States-backed Western Europe can gradually expand eastward, by political means, the border of freedom. An East-Central Europe from which Soviet political control has been eliminated, would change the whole strategic picture. The Soviet Union would become a danger of manageable dimension, a danger which could largely be checked by local means alone, leaving American power free to look after its numerous global commitments. It would become itself a vulnerable target of Western political warfare aimed at transforming Soviet Russia into an open society by the Western-supported exertions of the peoples directly concerned.

The short-range stake of the West in East-Central Europe has increased and not diminished as a result of what, for want of a better name, is described as nuclear stalemate. As long, indeed, as the United States possessed overwhelming nuclear supremacy, the security of Western Europe was absolute. Strategically it mattered little whether the peoples of East-Central Europe were friendly or hostile to the Soviet Union. Once, however, the Soviet Union has acquired a significant strategic nuclear striking power, both nuclear powers are reluctant to resort to these frightening weapon systems. Unlike the West, however, the Soviet Union is systematically engaged in gaining ground by exploiting, on the one hand, its superior ground forces and, on the other, the fear and sense of responsibility of the West.

This analysis of the dangers the West is still faced with in Western Europe seems to be largely confirmed by certain conclusions drawn by responsible quarters of the United States from the Cuban confrontation. It was stressed that the success of the confrontation on the withdrawal of Soviet missiles was primarily due to the strategic advantages enjoyed by the United States in the Caribbean area. It was furthermore underscored that because of the specific strategic conditions involved, the Cuban confrontation does not provide a valid indication of Soviet behavior in different circumstances. This could only mean that in Cuba the United States could impose its will without having to resort to a nuclear war, while the Soviets could only counter U.S. action by having recourse to its strategic nuclear arms. In Europe, the situation is exactly the opposite. Hence the crisis of confidence marked by attempts to build up independent nuclear striking forces in Europe. Hence also the American insistence to build up the conventional forces of NATO and thereby reduce the capability of Moscow to score gains by intimidation and blackmail.

In these conditions, every factor which weighs negatively in the calculus of risk of the Soviet Union acquires strategic significance. One of such factors is certainly the trouble-making capacity of the people of Eastern Europe. Whether or not the Soviet rulers must reckon in their calculations with a significant risk factor in the area lying between their borders and their Western targets may influence the degree of their recklessness. This would be particularly relevant in a situation like that in Berlin, in which the objective is precisely to make the West believe that the choice is confined to

risking all-out nuclear war or making concessions that would discredit American reliability and induce in Western Europe "realistic" trends toward disengagement and neutrality.

It is within the power of the West to compel the Soviet rulers to reckon with an important risk factor in Eastern Europe. The risk factor is indeed in direct ratio with the intensity of the spirit of resistance of the people of East-Central Europe. And the latter hinges on the prevailing impression with regard to the will to win of the West and with regard to the Western commitment to the cause of their freedom and independence. These are the sources of hope on which the spirit of resistance feeds.

Until the Cuban events, the prevailing impression on both counts was negative. Hope in a better future and faith in the West, and with them the spirit of resistance, were at their lowest ebb. The Cuban confrontation has somewhat improved the assessment of Western will and power. Should the West, as it is hoped, appear henceforth consistently in the posture of the firm and winning side, the problem of keeping hope alive and thereby strengthening the East-Central European deterrent will have been largely solved. It remains however for the West to prove its concern for the people of East-Central Europe. This can only be accomplished by an early and clear identification of the West with the peoples of the captive countries and their goal to recover free choice in regard to their internal and international affairs.

Such a long-range objective is not unrealistic. Liberation without war, though not without protracted political struggle, is possible. The Soviet empire is obviously rent by serious internal contradictions. The difficulty of maintaining ideological unity and central direction, as illustrated by the Sino-Soviet discord; the inability of the Soviet Union to keep up the armament race without withdrawing some of the material improvements its people have gained in the last few years, and/or without diminishing their abnormally high investments in the heavy industry; the imbalanced nature of the Communist economy and the utter failure of collectivized agriculture; the increasing nonconformity of youth and the ferment among intellectuals; the unbridgeable gulf between the requirements of subordination and exploitation in the Soviet empire, and the national pride of the historic nations of East-Central Europe—these are but a few of the contradictions. If they have, as yet, not generated dramatic consequences, this is largely due to the demoralizing effect of the easy and unnecessary successes Western misjudgment, irresolution and weakness have afforded to the U.S.S.R. Ever since the end of the Second World War, the Soviets have been permitted to show, by their actions, that history was on their side; that changes invariably occur in their favor and that, accordingly, the victory of communism on a worldwide scale is only a matter of time. If the West were to act on the perfectly justified assumption that the Soviet empire has more reasons to fear any major war than the West, it could at least deny its adversary any further successes. The effect would be most far reaching. The latent forces of disruption and opposition, no longer inhibited by a sentiment of futility, would be unleashed in Eastern Europe. In favorable circumstances, which can be fostered by a purposeful Western policy, such as a struggle for supreme power or internal disturbances in the Soviet Union that would tie down the Soviet armed forces, the captive nations could begin making good their escape.

III

In the view of the Assembly of Captive European Nations, the morale of the captive European peoples and their faith in the West would be bolstered, and the interest—short and long term—of both free and captive nations would be advanced should the United States and her principal allies adopt the specific measures listed under "What to do," while refraining from the action listed under "What not to do."

What to do

(1) To raise in all high-level conferences with the rulers of the Soviet Union the issue of the restoration of the right of self-determination to the peoples of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania.

(2) To counter Soviet demands on Berlin with the plan for an overall peace settlement based on the right of self-determination and designed to solve all the unresolved consequences of the Second War in Europe.

(3) To inscribe the question of the denial of self-determination to the nations of East-Central Europe on the agenda of the United Nations regardless of the prospect to secure the required majorities. To raise, in other words, the issue in the U.N. on its merits and not as a mere point of rebuttal.

The initial purpose of such action would be to assure the peoples concerned that their issue is an objective of Western policy, an open and not a closed issue as claim the Soviet rulers. This would be accomplished if a group of Western Powers, backed by the United States, would take the initiative. For durable impact, such action would have to be renewed at every session on the pattern of the wearing-down tactics followed by the Soviet Union on the question of the Chinese representations in the United Nations. The Western Powers could easily pattern their draft resolution on one of the proposals introduced in the United Nations by the Soviet Union. The draft resolution introduced by the Soviet delegation on April 24, 1962, in the Special Committee on Decolonization, is almost ideally suited for this purpose.

(4) To keep the question of Hungary on the agenda of each United Nations General Assembly session and renew steadfastly the demand for compliance with past resolutions.

(5) To give assurance to the people of Albania that the territorial integrity of their country and their right of self-determination will be safeguarded against any intervention on the part of their neighbors.

(6) To maintain carefully the policy of nonrecognition of the forcible incorporation of the Baltic States in the Soviet Union.

(7) To insist that the United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples is of universal scope and validity and, accordingly, oppose the double-standard gaining ground in the U.N. on self-determination, and to urge the Special Committee of 24 Nations, charged with the implementation of the above declaration, to extend its concern and investigation to the peoples and countries subjected to Soviet colonial rule.

(8) To carry out in the United Nations and at all appropriate international gatherings a campaign of truth with respect to the denial of human rights and freedom in the captive countries.

(9) To give support in the United Nations to the proposal of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions for an investigation of the condition and status of political prisoners and for the elaboration and enactment of an international convention on the regime of the political prisoners.

(10) To be always mindful, in their trading policies, of the fact that the interests of the welfare of the captive peoples and of the security of the West are both adversely affected by the preferential treatment given by the Communist regimes in East-Central Europe to the development of heavy and armament industries, at the expense of the needs of the people concerned. Similarly, to take advantage of trade negotiations in order to press for the suppression of existing prohibitive duties on individual food, clothing, and medicine gift packages from the free world to individuals in the captive countries.

(11) To develop, extend and invigorate broadcasts to the captive countries, and to consider the establishment, in the framework of NATO, of a general staff for political warfare.

(12) To warn all Western visitors to the captive countries against permitting their hosts to use them as tools of their political propaganda, as well as against fraternization with local Communist leaders.

What not to do

(1) Not to engage in actions or enter into agreements implying or suggesting that the Western Powers have reconciled themselves to the status quo and regard it as final. The oft-mentioned idea of a nonaggression pledge or pact between the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries would certainly be construed by the people of East-Central Europe as a Western sellout. Such pledges would give the Soviet Union or their puppets no guarantees of security that are not already embodied in the United Nations Charter. The only reason the Soviet rulers have consistently sought them was their awareness that they would create legal obstacles to any further Western concern with the fate of the captive peoples, and that, by generating discouragement and resignation, they will have consequences highly detrimental to Western security. Past commitments, declared principles and self-interest, therefore equally command to the Western Powers to stand firmly on the position that any and all security arrangements should follow, and not precede, an overall European settlement based on the right of self-determination.

(2) Not to undertake actions and moves which give respectability to the satellite regimes and compound the damaging effects of past acts of recognition.

(3) Not to grant aid, long or short term credits to the satellite regimes. Assistance in the special case of Poland can only be justified to the extent it helps preserve the gains the Polish people wrested in 1956. The helping countries should, therefore, make it clear that any aid would terminate if there is a return to forced collectivization, and/or if the rights of the church, the freedom of worship or any other rights or freedoms were further curtailed.

(4) Not to place undue reliance on the political benefits to be drawn from exchange programs, and to insist on full reciprocity in such exchanges.

NEW YORK, *March 1963.*

FORMATION OF CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR A FREE CUBA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to a most encouraging development relating to the question of Cuba.

I think we are all agreed that something must be done about Cuba, that the continued existence of a Communist dictatorship 90 miles from our shores is intolerable. We are all agreed that the means must be found, short of war, to liberate the Cuban people from Castroism and to put an end to the threat of Communist subversion and infiltration of the American States by the Kremlin's beachhead forces in Cuba.

It is understandable and proper that there should be differences of opinion on the means to be employed and on the timetable which must govern the application of these means.

It is unfortunate, however, that there should be a polarization of opinion on the question of Cuba, because the solution of this question imperatively demands the greatest possible degree of national unity.

It is also unfortunate that some of the criticism of our present Cuban policy has been characterized by partisan overtones. It is unfair, as well as unfortunate, because some of these partisan critics conveniently forget that Castro came to power under a Republican administration, which for some strange reason ignored warnings from many sources that Castro was a Communist and his movement was Communist dominated.

Last week the press announced the establishment of the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba, as a broad nonpartisan organization dedicated to the goal of Cuban liberation. I consider this a most welcome development.

In its declaration of purpose, the committee particularly emphasizes its nonpartisan nature. It says that it believes that Cuba is an issue that transcends party differences, and that its solution demands the kind of national unity the American people have manifested at moments of crisis.

The Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba plans to initiate a nationwide discussion on the problem of Cuba, and to establish an information service on Cuba and the Castro-Communist subversion of Latin America. In collaboration with Freedom House of New York, it convened a Free Cuba Assembly, at Ardsleigh, N.Y., last week, at which top authorities on Latin America examined the problem of Cuba in all its aspects. The findings of this assembly will soon be published.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the statement of purpose of the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba, as well as a list of the distinguished citizens who have thus far joined the committee. I also ask consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial on Cuba which appeared in last Tuesday's Washington Post, and which, I believe, spoke for the American people when it declared that something must be done about communism in Cuba.

There being no objection, the statement of purpose, list of citizens, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE OF CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR A FREE CUBA

The Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba is being formed in response to a statement issued by Freedom House, on March 25, 1963, calling upon Americans to unite in a movement for a free Cuba.

The committee is nonpartisan. It believes that Cuba is an issue that transcends party differences, and that its solution requires the kind of national unity we have always manifested at moments of great crisis. This belief is reflected in the broad and representative membership of the committee.

The committee holds, with Freedom House, that a Communist Cuba is intolerable, not only for reasons which bear upon our security but also because it has betrayed 6 million people who won their freedom from the Batista dictatorship.

But the enslavement of those 6 million may now lead to the enslavement of the more than 200 million people in the 19 remaining Latin American Republics, for the Communists, from their base in Cuba, have launched a grand offensive aimed at conquering, initially, the entire continent south of the Rio Grande. Ultimately, that offensive is directed at the chief bastion of world democracy, the United States.

The situation of Latin America, thanks primarily to the continued existence of a Soviet base in Cuba, is far worse than the American people realize. The Communist drive there is already on the way toward producing these serious consequences:

1. The demoralization of Latin America's democratic forces, who are beginning to feel overwhelmed before the combined power of the Cuban military-police state, the Soviet Union, and Red China.

2. The resurgence of dictatorial military elements intent on taking power in reaction to the Communist threat.

3. The infiltration and subversion of other Latin American governments at a tempo which may produce additional Cubas before long.

4. The frustration of inter-American efforts to achieve social and economic progress.

If not halted before much more time has passed, the Communist drive south of the Rio Grande could result in the gradual isolation of the United States from its friends and allies in Latin America—the reverse of the effort to isolate Communist Cuba.

The American people are united on the objective of a liberated Cuba. The President and the leaders of both major political parties have publicly committed themselves to that objective. Differences exist, however, on how and when to attain a free Cuba, and the problem is to devise a means of liberating Cuba from communism before communism succeeds in creating other Cubas, yet at the same time preserving the peace of the Americas.

The Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba believes that solutions to the problem can be found, and that, properly presented to the American people, they will command overwhelming support. To that end, the committee proposes:

1. To initiate, free of partisan bias, a nationwide discussion on the problem of Cuba, the threat its Communist regime poses to the Americas, and the measures that must be taken to put an end to it.

2. To establish, as an aid to intelligent and informed discussion, a national information service to disseminate regularly facts on Cuba and the Castro-Communist subversion of Latin America that are generally not circulated.

3. To join in the convening of a Free Cuba Assembly, at which all aspects of the problem will be submitted for the consideration of top authorities in Latin American and global affairs.

It is the hope of the Free Cuba Committee that such a program will help point the way to an effective Cuban policy, and that it will help create a climate of public opinion that will facilitate positive action.

An Alliance for Freedom must now be forged in the Americas if the Alliance for Progress is to succeed, and if the peoples of the Western Hemisphere are to live and work as free human beings for the society of peace and plenty they all seek. It is also an urgent requirement of American national interests. The indispensable first step toward the forging of such an Alliance is the liberation of the Cuban people from Communist tyranny.

The cause of a free Cuba is the cause of the free Americas.

MEMBERSHIP LIST OF CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR A FREE CUBA

Daniel James, executive secretary, author ("Cuba: The First Soviet Satellite in the Americas"), and foreign correspondent.

MEMBERS

Mariada Arensberg, executive secretary, Cuban Freedom Committee.

Murray Baron, labor-management consultant.

Joseph Beirne, president, Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO.

Nicholas Duke Biddle, chairman, Caribbean committee, International Rescue Service.

Irving Brown, U.N. Representative, International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

Adm. Arleigh A. Burke (ret.), former Chief, U.S. Naval Operations.

Dickey Chapelle, author and foreign correspondent.

Leo Cherne, president, Research Institute of America.

Ernest Cuneo, chairman of the board, North American Newspaper Alliance; attorney.

Christopher Emmet, chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations.

John Fisher, president, American Security Council, Chicago.

Dr. Russell H. Fitzgibbon, professor of Latin American history, University of California, Los Angeles.

Dr. Buell Gallagher, president, City College of New York.

Dr. Harry Gideonse, president, Brooklyn College.

Frances R. Grant, executive secretary, Inter-American Committee for Democracy and Freedom.

Paul Hall, president, Seafarers International Union.

Hal Hendrix, Latin American editor, Miami News.

Brig. Gen. Frank L. Howley (retired), New York University.

Dr. Sidney Hook, professor of philosophy, New York University.

Dr. Harry Kantor, professor of Latin American history, University of Florida.

Rev. John Lafarge, S.J., associate editor, America.

Jay Lovestone, director of international. publications, AFL-CIO.

Clare Boothe Luce, former U.S. Ambassador to Italy.

Eugene Lyons, senior editor, Readers' Digest.

Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshal, military commentator.

Henry Mayers, president, Cold War Council, Los Angeles.

Benjamin McLaurin, vice president, International Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

Dr. Hans J. Morgenthau, director, Center for Study of American Foreign Policy, Chicago.

Edgar Ansel Mower, author and foreign correspondent.

John O'Rourke, editor, Washington News.

Bonaro Overstreet, author, psychologist.

Bishop James A. Pike, Protestant Episcopal Bishop of California.

Virginia Prewett, Latin American columnist, North American Newspaper Alliance.

Victor Riesel, Labor columnist, Hall Syndicate.

Dr. John P. Roche, professor of labor and social thought, Brandeis University.

Serafino Romualdi, American Institute for Free Labor Development.

Sal B. Hoffmann, president, Upholsterers' International Union, AFL-CIO.

Dr. Robert Strausz-Hupe, director, Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania.

Arthur G. McDowell, secretary, Council Against Communist Aggression.

Dr. Frank Tannenbaum, professor of Latin American history, Columbia University.

William vanden Heuvel, president, International Rescue Committee.

Dr. Arthur P. Whitaker, professor of Latin American history, University of Pennsylvania.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 23, 1963]

REMEMBER THE MAINE

Something like a consensus on Cuban policy is beginning to emerge in this country.

The debate over when and how that policy is to be executed should not conceal the growing accord on the policy itself. Last week, the President, the former Vice President, the State Department, and Republican critics of the State Department had different things to say about Cuba, but on two points there was general agreement. And on these two points there is a gathering agreement in the country.

The broad proposition on which there is accumulating accord is simply this: that the existence of a Communist regime, linked to the Soviet Union, in this hemisphere, is a threat to the safety and survival of the United States and of all other free countries in this part of the globe. No administration that openly opposes this belief can long survive. Sooner or later an administration that denounced this maturing conviction would be followed by an alternative government committed to it. In a negative way, there is almost the same accord on how this policy should not be pursued. There is almost universal agreement that invasion, openly and directly, immediately or in the near future, is not the way to pursue our policy.

This aversion to foreign control of Cuba by a hostile power is the constant of American attitudes toward our island neighbor. The Monroe Doctrine was an expression of a view already long held in this country. It was given even fuller expression in the administration of John Quincy Adams when this country made known its opposition to the transfer of Cuba from Spain to France, England, or any other power. The practical basis of this policy was clearly stated in Daniel Webster's support of President Adams' decision to send delegates to a conference with South American countries, in which the great orator said:

"A member has said that if Spain chose to transfer the island to any other power she has a right to do so, and we here cannot interfere to prevent her. I must dissent from this opinion. The rights of nations in matters of this kind are much modified by circumstances. Because France or Great Britain could not rightfully complain of the transfer of Florida to us, it does not follow that we could not complain of the cession of Cuba to one of them. The transfer of Florida to us was not dangerous to the safety of either of these nations, nor fatal to any of their great and essential interests. Proximity of position, neighborhood, whatever augments the power of injuring or annoying, very properly belong to the consideration of all cases of this kind. What might otherwise never be thought of is justified for these reasons and on these grounds."

If the American people are aware of such dangers now, they are aware of other dangers that unhappily and unfortunately also exist and that must be weighed with equal care and caution. Impetuous and impulsive and ill-considered acts by this country might bring on the dangers of thermonuclear war without diminishing the dangers of Soviet occupation of Cuba.

Therefore, it must be the object of the Government of the United States to develop some alternative to direct action that will further the policy of this country without incurring the hazard of invasion or like military intervention. It is very urgent that the Government develop such a policy and that it disclose it. It is very plain that, throughout this country, the conviction that the Nation is in peril is hardening to a point where no threats and no fears may be sufficient to inhibit the demand for action against the forces that occupy Cuba. Democratic governments are not wholly free agents. A government that does not develop a program of minimum risk runs the danger of being coerced into a program of maximum risks, almost against its will. The absence of an affirmative design, in such a situation, is dangerous—dangerous to this country, to its neighbors and to the peace of the hemisphere and of the whole world.

The Government of this country, the governments of friendly countries and the Government of the Soviet Union as well had better take note of the increasing sense of Americans that the United States is endangered by the Soviet occupation of Cuba. This sense of jeopardy is beginning to pervade the whole body politic. The Soviet Government, whatever its fears and doubts, felt compelled, by such an impulse, to send its forces into Hungary. It ought to understand the much greater force that such sentiments exert upon democratic governments. Every day that passes without the termination of the Soviet occupation of Cuba increases the certainty and multiplies the likelihood that another *Maine* disaster will put the spark to the combustible materials in the Caribbean.

RETIREMENT OF THE VERY REVEREND LAURENCE J. McGINLEY, S.J., AS PRESIDENT OF FORDHAM UNIVERSITY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on April 25, Fordham University announced the retirement of the Very Reverend Laurence J. McGinley, S.J., from the posts of president and rector of Fordham University. Father McGinley will be succeeded in these posts by the Reverend Vincent T. O'Keefe, S.J., at the end of the current academic year. Father O'Keefe is now executive vice president of the university, a position he has held since June 1962.

On relinquishing his present positions at Fordham, Father McGinley will serve as a consultant in higher education for the Jesuit Order.

Father O'Keefe takes over the duties of president and rector as the university enters on the second phase of its contemporary physical and academic growth at the Lincoln Square and Rose Hill campuses. He recently completed guidance of a 3-year self-study and evaluation of the university as a basis for the overall planning of Fordham's next decade of scholastic development.

Father McGinley has been president and rector of Fordham longer than any other man in its 122-year history. He was appointed February 2, 1949, and this year will participate in his 15th annual commencement exercises as president. During his tenure, the university will have conferred approximately 24,000 graduate and undergraduate degrees from its 9 colleges and schools.

As president, Father McGinley initiated a new university campus in mid-Manhattan—Fordham at Lincoln Square, a $25,500,000 educational center that already houses the school of law and law library. Scheduled for construction in the immediate future are buildings to house the university's schools of education, business, social service, and general studies. As a campus, it will accommodate some 8,000 students and serve as companion to traditional Fordham at Rose Hill. The new buildings are to be ready for occupancy in September 1965.

Other highlights of his tenure as president include the completion of the university's campus center building on the Rose Hill campus, a three-story structure with a wide variety of accommodations for cultural, social, and academic activities; the new Jesuit residence, Faber Hall, with housing facilities for 100 faculty members; the addition to Dealy Hall, the home of the Rose Hill campus division of the school of business; and Martyrs' Court, containing seven residence halls for upperclassmen.

During his presidency, also, charters have been granted to Fordham by these national scholastic honor societies: Phi Beta Kappa; Sigma Xi, a society to encourage original investigation in pure and applied science; and Pi Sigma Alpha, the political science fraternity.

The honors program of Fordham College, initiated to encourage independent scholarship among undergraduates, the junior year abroad, in Europe and in South America, and the Institute of Contemporary Russian Studies, the purpose of which is to foster the understanding of Russian culture and language, were initiated during his term of office. The first Rhodes and Marshall scholarships were won in this same period.

In June of 1961, the university, through Father McGinley, announced the opening of the Center of Intercultural Formation, in Mexico and Brazil, established to prepare both lay and religious personnel for service in Central and South America. The center, which he serves as president of the board of directors, gives intensive 4-month programs in the languages, history and social, economic and cultural conditions of Latin American countries.

A native New Yorker, Father McGinley was born on West 105th Street, September 6, 1905, the son of James and Alice (McCabe) McGinley. For many years his father was chief of staff to the commissioner of accounts of the city of New York. Father McGinley's younger brother, Rev. James J. McGinley, also a member of the Society of Jesus, is president and rector of Canisius College, Buffalo.

Father McGinley attended Public School 128 in Brooklyn and Xavier High School, Manhattan, and for a short period was employed in the First National Bank of New York. Xavier High School recently awarded him its Insignis Medal, given "to honor alumni who by their service to God and the civic community distinguished themselves as eminently representative of their alma mater and worthy of her special recognition."

He has been a member of the Society of Jesus since 1922, receiving his bachelor's and master's degrees from the society's college in Woodstock, Md. From 1929 to 1932 he taught at St. Joseph's Preparatory School, Philadelphia, returning to Woodstock in 1932 for theological studies.

Ordained to the priesthood in 1935, he received his licentiate in sacred theology the following year, and served for a time as chaplain at City Home Hospital on Welfare Island, N.Y. After further studies, he went to Rome in 1937 for graduate courses in theology at the Gregorian University and the Biblical

Institute, receiving his doctorate in sacred theology 2 years later.

In 1939 he served as director of the Vatican radio broadcasts, returning to the United States in the same year to become professor of theology at Woodstock College. After 1942, Father McGinley was prefect of studies, regent of the seminary and director of graduate studies at Woodstock, as well as associate editor of Theological Studies. He was a consultor of the Provincial of the New York Province of the Society of Jesus from 1943 to 1952.

Father McGinley is author of various articles in Theological Studies, Thought, Verbum Domini—Rome—and of the book, "Form-Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives," published in 1944.

Active in educational circles, he is past president and vice president of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools; former vice chairman of that association's commission on institutes of higher education; past president of the Association of Urban Universities, and presently a director of the New York Higher Education Assistance Corp. Other educational organizations of which he is a member are the New York State Advisory Council on Higher Education, and the council on higher educational institutions in New York City.

In 1960, Father McGinley was appointed to membership on the Commission on Federal Relations of the American Council on Education and was elected a director of the parent organization the following year to complete a term which expired in December 1962.

Father McGinley has been active also in the Association of Colleges and Universities of the State of New York, and its commission on independent colleges and universities. He served the association as president from 1957 to 1958, prior to which time he was secretary-treasurer. Since 1959 he has been a director of the New York World's Fair 1964–65 Corp., and director of the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts since 1956.

Father McGinley was national awards chairman of the Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge in 1959, and has served on the Army Advisory Panel for ROTC affairs since 1958.

Among the honors accorded him are the following:

The American Irish Historical Society Gold Medal, 1960; the University Brotherhood Award of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1960; U.S. Army Outstanding Civilian Service Medal, 1962; Civic Award in Education, the Bronx Board of Trade, 1961; decorations from the Governments of Peru, Brazil, Chile, Italy, and most recently, the Grand Gold Badge of Honor for Merits to the Republic of Austria at the Austrian Embassy, Washington, 1963.

All who know Father McGinley, and all who know of the tremendous contributions he has made to Fordham University and to the whole educational world, will join me in paying tribute to this great scholar and educator as he lays down the enormous burden which he has carried so well for many years.

WHEAT REFERENDUM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Oregon has over 16,000 farmers who grow wheat and feed grains. Annually they produce and sell for cash about $45 million worth of wheat and around $30 million in feed grains.

This is modest production and income compared with the large wheat States—yet for these 16,000 farmers, wheat and feed grains are important and major cash crops—and they represent an important segment of our agricultural economy in Oregon.

Oregon grain farmers take a pragmatic approach to legislation affecting wheat and feed grains for this very reason. For 10 consecutive years, Oregon wheat farmers voted overwhelmingly in favor of marketing quotas in the national wheat referendums.

I am confident wheat farmers of Oregon will make their decision in the May 21 wheat referendum on the same practical dollars-and-cents basis. The difference between a "yes" and "no" vote in the referendum can mean over $15 million in wheat income in Oregon. If I know Oregon farmers, they're going to vote their pocketbooks again in this referendum.

The 1964 wheat program is a good program. It assures a high level of wheat income and it stabilizes wheat production in line with demand, permits orderly disposal of our large surplus stocks.

Wheat farmers understand this. They understand that we cannot go on producing wheat on a continuing surplus basis and maintain price. They understand that they can't receive assured income without stabilizing production at usable levels.

That is why this bill had—and still has—the support of all the farm organizations except one and the support of most all of the cooperative and commodity groups interested in wheat.

Oregon has over 5,500 small allotment wheat farmers. For the first time in the history of wheat programs these farmers will be able to vote in a referendum and participate in the benefits of the wheat program. They will be treated exactly the same as major wheatgrowers. They will receive $2 for their wheat on 80 percent of their quota and the basic support of $1.30 for all the rest they can harvest on their allotment. Additionally, if they so desire, they can divert all their acres and receive diversion payments equal to 50 percent of parity times the average yield times the number of acres.

The certificates—having a value of 70 cents per bushel—represent a built-in insurance feature for all wheat farmers in case of crop failure.

I have no hesitation about urging all the wheat farmers in Oregon to vote "yes" in the May 21 referendum. Since a two-thirds approval is necessary to put the 1964 wheat program into operation this means that attitude alone is not enough; it means that every wheat farmer who cares about his wheat income has to take the trouble to vote on that day.

Any farmer who believes that new and better wheat legislation will be passed by this session of the Congress in the event a "no" vote prevails, is taking the riskiest kind of gamble. My distinguished colleague who heads the Senate Agriculture Committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], is reported by the press the other day to have said: "You can put this in bold type: there will not be any more wheat laws passed this year if the referendum fails. I will do everything on earth to stop it."

My recommendation is for wheat farmers to vote on the economic merits of the 1964 wheat program on May 21 and not on any pig in the poke.

In addition to approval of the wheat program, farmers need a feed grain program as well. Two weeks ago the House passed a good voluntary feed grain program—and it is my hope that the Senate will have before it in a few days the same program for consideration. I will support it.

As I read the program passed by the House, it will accomplish four necessary objectives:

First. It will raise farm income, by assuring fairer prices for feed grain producers and by providing a basis of stability for livestock prices.

Second. It will bring down further the surplus stocks of feed grains.

Third. It will save millions of dollars in costs to taxpayers, in contrast to the Government storage program which would be in effect without this legislation.

Fourth. It will give the wheat and feed grains producer new freedom and flexibility in the management and operation of his own farm. It will enable him to substitute acre for acre between feed grains and wheat whenever he finds that by doing so he will increase the efficiency and effectiveness of his own personal farming operation. Since this feed grains program is complementary to and interrelated to the wheat program enacted by Congress last year, prompt action on this feed grains measure is urgently needed so that wheat producers will have all of the available information in making their decision in the referendum on the 1964 wheat program on May 21, 1963.

By providing a permanent wheat program and a feed grain program, Congress will have made one of the most constructive steps in many years toward solving a major and plaguing problem in agriculture—that of income and surpluses, and at much less cost to the taxpayer. Congress and this administration can be proud of this accomplishment after 8 long years of declining farm income and mounting surpluses.

If Congress can move forward in the same constructive way in the other problem areas of agriculture, it will have accomplished a near miracle. I see no reason why we cannot—and I can think of every reason why we should.

I know that efforts are being made to turn this into a vote for or against "Government intervention" in wheat. That is pretty much of a phony issue. Government intervention in wheat production and marketing began in the 1930's, when the depression and its terrible impact upon farming brought about the

first efforts to curb production. Let it be remembered that most of the research that has enabled American farmers to grow so much wheat per acre was largely financed by the Federal Government and that was "Government intervention," too.

The offer of a guaranteed price to accompany production controls is the proposal being offered by the Government. Wheat growers are free to reject it; but eventually, wheat production will be curbed by the market conditions that will simply force large numbers of growers to give up farming.

That is the real issue, not "Government intervention."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], to strike out, on page 9, line 3, "$450 million" and insert in lieu thereof "$250 million." On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is the pending business still the amendment I offered yesterday, or has it been supplanted temporarily by another amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct in the first part of his statement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My amendment is still the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to temporarily postpone consideration of the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, there is an amendment at the desk that I want to offer for myself and for both Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING] and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] to House bill 5517, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut, for himself and the Senators from New York and Pennsylvania, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is provided, on page 11, after line 16, to insert the following:

GRANTS FOR MATERNAL AND CHILD WELFARE

For an additional amount for "Grants for maternal and child welfare," $1,000,000, of which $800,000 shall be available for child welfare services, and $200,000 for research, training, or demonstration projects in child welfare.

On page 11, line 24, to strike out "$68,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$90,000."

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to provide some funds so that the day-care program for children of working mothers can get underway without further delay and so that the training of additional child welfare personnel may begin.

I have been as concerned as any Member of this body in the growing problems of welfare throughout our country. I knew these problems as a Governor; and as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare I was anxious to see some constructive progress made in the direction of our Federal welfare programs.

At HEW last year we developed with the Congress the first major reform of the Nation's welfare laws since the Social Security Act was passed in 1935. To its great credit, Congress last year faced up to the problems of welfare and recognized that the only long-range solution lies with prevention of dependency before it occurs and rehabilitation to get people off relief and back into useful roles in society. The Congress, in passing the 1962 amendments, agreed that just giving money to people to keep them alive does not solve the problem. When people need assistance in these prosperous times, poverty is not their only trouble. In fact, they are poor because they have other troubles—bad health, functional illiteracy, lack of skills, or some combination.

A key feature of these amendments was aid to States for the development and expansion of day-care services. We hear a lot of criticism of mothers who could work remaining on public assistance. But a recent study of families with dependent children showed that 90 percent of them had small children at home.

What would happen to those children if these mothers, or even a portion of them, went to work?

In the entire United States, there are just 18,000 licensed day-care facilities, and they can accommodate 185,000 children. But there are, today, 9 million children under 12 years of age whose mothers are in the labor force. If present trends continue, the number of women in the labor force will increase 31 percent in the next decade.

What is to be done to keep their children from roaming the streets, to protect them from the degrading and demoralizing experiences that come to children when they are left on their own too early? We have more latchkey children today than we had at the height of World War II. How much worse can we let this situation get? How much higher will we let our juvenile delinquency rates rise before we follow through on the constructive program authorized a year ago when the public welfare amendments were passed?

Funds for day care for children—to get mothers off the assistance rolls and to protect the children of mothers who are already working—are called for in the 1962 amendments. The funds were authorized; they were not appropriated. They were provided for in a supplemental appropriation last year which failed of enactment during the closing days of the last session. They have been provided in the supplemental appropriation passed by the House. They are not included in the supplemental appropriation bill now before the Senate.

That is why I am proposing an amendment to restore to the supplemental appropriation bill a total of $1 million—$800,000 to make an immediate beginning, in all the States, for day care services, and $200,00 for the training of child welfare personnel. And a few additional positions in the Children's Bureau are needed to get this program started.

Nothing could be more shortsighted than to deny funds for day care and force mothers who could work to give up their jobs and return to the relief rolls. We know that constructive steps can be taken. In North Carolina last year a mother of four children was able to reduce her aid to dependent children payment in half when day care funds made it possible for her to work. A mother of two children, left without support, stayed off relief completely because of day care arrangements for her children that enabled her to get a job as a stenographer. These examples can be repeated throughout the country.

We all want to see the costs of welfare reduced. But in the long run savings will be made only if constructive alternatives are provided to a life of perpetual dependency.

One of the best answers is the opportunity to work. Day-care funds help to give mothers that opportunity.

The States are eagerly waiting to get started on this vital program. Many groups in communities all over the Nation are hopeful they can begin expanding these day-care facilities without further delay. We must not fail them now. The amendments I propose are as follows:

On page 11, after line 16, insert the following:

GRANTS FOR MATERNAL AND CHILD WELFARE

For an additional amount for "Grants for maternal and child welfare," $1,000,000, of which $800,000 shall be available for child welfare services, and $200,000 for research, training, or demonstration projects in child welfare.

On page 11, line 24, strike out "$68,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$90,000."

I also hope that the cut which has been made in salaries and expenses for the Bureau of Family Services will be substantially restored in conference. A major part of the Federal burden of carrying out the 1962 Public Welfare Amendments falls on this Bureau. They carry the Federal Government's responsibility for administering the Nation's $5 billion public assistance programs. We expect them to help States and communities provide the services that will help many of the 7 million needy people become self-reliant and self-supporting. We expect them to see that States operate their programs efficiently so that ineligible people are not certified for aid.

And yet, having added immeasurably to their responsibilities by genuinely progressive legislation, we deny them the personnel to discharge their added responsibilities.

The Congress passed the 1962 Public Welfare Amendments because it wanted to move constructively toward solving the problem of poverty. One ingredient of success is a competent and adequate staff. Fifty positions were included in the House allowance to administer the welfare amendments.

If the 50 positions originally requested were allowed, there would be available to the Bureau of Family Services a total of only 443 positions to administer this multibillion-dollar program. It is my hope that these needed positions will be restored in conference.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of our colleagues in the Senate, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and I, too, of course, are interested in the precise definition of what these funds would be used for if they were appropriated in the pending bill.

Section 527 of the Social Security Act, the Public Welfare Amendments Act of 1962, reads as follows:

SEC. 527. (a) In order to assist the States to provide adequately for the care and protection of children whose parents are, for part of the day, working or seeking work, or otherwise absent from the home or unable for other reasons to provide parental supervision, the portion of the appropriation under section 521 for any fiscal year which is not allotted under section 522 shall be allotted by the Secretary—

And so forth. The point of the question is, What do the words "or otherwise absent from home or unable for other reasons to provide parental supervision" mean? Do they open up a general operation for children who require day care, whatever may be the reason; or is it the intention of the Senator who proposes the amendment—and, of course, that includes me too, and my intention—that it shall be utilized for the protection of children whose parents are working or seeking work?

Is it to be the true classic day-care program; and that these general words of extension, "for other reasons to provide parental supervision," whatever they may mean, will not apply to this appropriation?

Mr. RIBICOFF. The Senator is correct. What we had in mind was the kind of situation where there might be a mother of children of tender years who is not on relief and who is not a public charge, and whose husband has a job, but who suddenly finds herself with the need for a very serious operation. She can go to the hospital for a month. Under those circumstances it would be possible for these minor children to have day care.

I believe that the Senator from New York, who is a cosponsor with me of the amendment, has raised a point which I believe should be in the RECORD as a matter of legislative history. Therefore I should like to give examples of the type of children who would be cared for under this program.

First. A substantial number of the 15 million children under 18 years of age in the United States whose mothers are working—4 million of these children are under 6 years of age, and 5 million are between the ages of 6 to 11.

Second. The children of employable mothers who are seeking employment—a recent study of families with dependent children showed that 90 percent of them had small children in the home—many of the mothers in these families would be able to seek employment were day care facilities available.

Third. Mentally retarded and other handicapped children whose parents are not able to provide continuing supervision over such children.

Fourth. Children of migrant agricultural workers—a number of States report a great need for this type of care.

In the entire United States, there are just 18,000 licensed day care facilities, and they can accommodate only 185,000 children. All but 3 of 44 States which participated in a recent survey indicated a serious need for additional day care facilities.

The day care program is designed primarily to help women in the low income group who are in the labor force or who are required to seek employment. Those mothers who can pay for part of the costs of day care will be expected to do so.

It is understood that the proposed day care program has been characterized as a baby sitting program. This description is completely inaccurate as indicated by the definition of day care included in the basic statute. There is no intention of providing services for the purpose of relieving parents of the care of their children while they run errands or seek recreation. The care would be related exclusively to those purposes described in the basic statute. Each State plan must include provision: For such safeguards as may be necessary to assure provision of day care under the plan only in cases in which it is in the best interest of the child and the mother and only in cases in which it is determined, under criteria established by the State, that a need for such care exists; and, in cases in which the family is able to pay part or all of the costs of such care, for payment of such fees as may be reasonable in the light of such ability, and for giving priority, in determining the existence of need for such day care, to members of low-income or other groups in the population and to geographical areas which have the greatest relative need for extension of such day care.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. PASTORE. As the Senator in charge of the bill, I am not in a position to accept the amendments, because I have not consulted with the other members of the committee. It is quite a large committee. However I have discussed the subject with the chairman of the appropriate subcommittee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

He has conveyed to me the assurance that, whatever I decide to do, he would support me in it. I certainly support the amendments sponsored by my good friend, the Senator from Connecticut. The amount of $102,500 for salaries and expenses was cut to $68,000. This was done in the markup of the bill. In view of the presentation made by the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from New York, I am sure that if this matter had been called to the attention of the committee, our action would have been otherwise. Also, we would be raising the figure from $68,000 to $90,000. The other amendment provides $1 million for grants for maternal and child welfare.

I believe that the requests are modest, and I hope the Senator will approve them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] was particularly interested in the amendment. I have tried to locate him to have him come to the floor. Before we on this side of the aisle can agree to the amendment I would like to have the Senator from Colorado have an opportunity of at least being consulted.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I have talked to the Senator from Colorado, who is detained in the Defense Subcommittee of Appropriations on a matter that demands his presence for some time. What I am trying to get is a firm statement from the Senator from Connecticut. I am willing to commit myself. The Senator from Colorado, I must say, wishes to be recorded as against the amendment, but he will not stand in the way of its being approved. Although the Senator from Colorado is opposed to it, he will not stand in its way, if it is clear what the intent of the amendment is. That is what we want to get from the Senator from Connecticut. Is it clear that this money will be used for the classic day care use, which is for working mothers or mothers seeking work?

Mr. RIBICOFF. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Whatever the words may include, this appropriation will not be used for anything but that classic case.

Mr. RIBICOFF. There is no intention to provide services for the purpose

of relieving parents from the responsibility of caring for their children. That is the responsibility of parents.

However I believe we all recognize the fact that we want to get people off relief. If a mother has children who are 4 or 5 years old, who will take care of the children while the mother is working? The purpose of the program is to have these children cared for. This would be an economical program.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is opposed to the amendment, but he will not stand in the way of the Senator in charge of the bill accepting the amendment. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] feels the same way. However, we must pinpoint the legislative intent; namely, that this money, if finally appropriated, will be used only for the classic day care purpose, that is, for the children of working mothers or mothers seeking work, period.

Does the Senator agree to that?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I agree to that; and that was my intention when I was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and submitted the proposal to Congress. I believe that will be found in my testimony before the appropriate committees. I know that was the intention of Congress when it passed similar legislation last year.

Mr. JAVITS. Then the Senator from Connecticut agrees to that?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Absolutely.

Mr. JAVITS. I do too. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. As a cosponsor I feel this moderate approach has much merit.

More than one-third of Pennsylvania's work force are women. Of these, 149,311 have at least 1 child under 6. A study of child care services in the State made in 1959 by the Fels Institute of the University of Pennsylvania showed that only 4,500 children are in day care centers or family day care homes. I know that many thousands of children of working mothers are inadequately cared for by neighbors or are "latch string children" without any supervision.

With the money which Pennsylvania would receive from Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department would develop new day care services in geographical areas where the employment of women is greatest. This would be done by assisting counties to operate day care centers themselves by reimbursing counties for the purchase of day care services for private agencies, by operating demonstration day care projects in public housing and by conducting training courses for personnel of newly established day care services.

Funds would also be used to expand the number of day care centers conducted during the summer and early fall for the children of migrant laborers who would otherwise be left in the camps under the supervision of older children while their mothers are in the field. The small Pennsylvania program which has been conducted for several years has received national attention. Funds would also be used for salaries of departmental staff to enforce the law requiring licensing of family day care homes operated for profit and to provide consultation to the operators of such homes.

The 1962 amendments to the Social Security Act require steady progress toward the goal of an adequate child care program in each of Pennsylvania's 67 counties. At present, 14 counties have no program and 19 others have personnel standards which do not meet Federal requirements. In order to improve this situation it will be necessary for Pennsylvania to recruit professionally trained personnel or to train promising young people in greater numbers than we have been able to do heretofore. At a recent meeting which the Pennsylvania department held with the deans of the three graduate schools of social work, they learned that student's tuition covers something less than one-half of the cost to the school of educating one student. On this account each of the three schools is planning only a small annual expansion in the future.

The funds which I hope will be restored to the HEW budget would assist the schools to expand their faculties in order that they can accept more students who will prepare for child welfare positions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added to the amendment to the pending supplemental bill previously offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] to restore $1 million to initiate a program of day care services for children of working mothers.

I am pleased that this amendment was adopted, and I wish to associate myself with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what I am about to propose is, in effect, a repetition of the request I made yesterday afternoon. I ask unanimous consent that on the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and all amendments thereto there be a limitation of debate of 1 hour, the time to be divided between the majority leader and the minority leader or to be assigned by them to whomever they may designate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I turn the control of my time over to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the chairman of the subcommittee, who is in charge of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, the time for the quorum call to be exclusive of the 30 minutes on each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will prevail. The amendment would strike $200 million from the $450 million requested in the appropriation for the accelerated public works program.

As I stated yesterday, of the $900 million that was authorized, of which $400 million was appropriated at the last session, $275 million is now obligated—$125 million was not obligated as of April 4.

If we make the amount $250 million instead of $450 million, and add the $125 million, there will be $375 million to spend for the accelerated public works program.

In addition, the committee of conference last year accepted the Senate committee's recommendation of language that the accelerated public works program should be justified or explained to the committee when the hearing took place this year. Actually, no justifications have been made as yet, because the administration has thus far not been able to present them.

Admitting that there are recommendations of something over a billion dollars from the various States and cities, these recommendations have not been shaken down as projects because many of the cities, towns, and States which will have to contribute have not yet committed themselves to their share of the financing. For these reasons, I maintain that the amount I propose would be entirely sufficient to carry the program forward and to help solve the problem of unemployment.

I believe that one other point that was brought up is very important. If the whole $900 million is appropriated and spent, it will provide about 110,000 on-site jobs. Off-site, it is estimated that there will be another 110,000 jobs created, or a total of 220,000 jobs. As I understand, this number is perhaps less than 1 percent of the total number of persons unemployed. All Senators want to provide employment for people in their States. But what is the best way to do it? Will the proposal in the bill help to do that? It will not help to provide permanent jobs. What we seek to provide are permanent jobs.

In the last month, three textile mills and one gun factory in Massachusetts have closed. That means that between 2,500 and 3,000 persons have lost their permanent jobs. Most of them are skilled workers. They are skilled in textile work and skilled in riflemaking.

Will those persons be helped by providing jobs on construction sites, such as the accelerated public works program calls for? It seems to me that the persons who will be employed on the jobs will be mostly construction workers. If a contractor needs a new construction worker, he will employ someone who has had construction experience. He may perhaps even employ him at overtime rates, rather than hire an inexperienced worker for that job.

My amendment will not necessarily diminish the program; it will make the program more realistic and more practical. If the program should be continued after next January, Congress would have another opportunity to examine it.

Mr. President, the latest figures show that the rate of unemployment is at a lower level than it has been for some time; and that the number of new jobs created in March were some 800,000, as compared with 200,000 fewer in the month of February.

So I hope this amendment, which I believe is realistic and sensible, and will help a comparatively few of our unemployed workers to get jobs during the next 6 months, will be adopted.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I am very much in favor of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts to the committee amendment; and I desire to point out that what I had to say during the last session of Congress about the $500 million program certainly holds true here.

I think the Senator from Massachusetts has made it abundantly clear that this money cannot be programed in an amount in excess of the $250 million which will remain if his amendment to the committee amendment is adopted, plus the carryover amounts which have not yet been programed.

So I hope the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts to the committee amendment will be adopted.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this amount, as approved by the committee, is a relatively small one for such a program; and I believe it certainly should not be reduced.

First of all, this $900 million program is relatively small, in view of the fact that there are so many legitimate demands for improvements of this type.

Of course, this amount has already been authorized, and I understand there are no plans to increase the authorization this year. So this program—being nationwide—is a modest one; and almost all of the program requires sizable local contributions in connection with the projects—a requirement which, in itself, is right and fair, and insures that the projects will actually serve the communities involved.

Mr. President, I am greatly impressed by the very fine manner in which—according to my observation—the program has been administered. Last fall, when it was enacted, it was impossible to know what its extent would be or what would be the attitude in connection with its administration. But all the projects which have come within my observation have been very carefully considered and scrutinized, and only the most meritorious have been able to survive. Furthermore, a very able man is at the head of the program; and I believe we can assume that that situation will continue.

This program supplies a very definite need. I understand that 72 percent of it has been on a grant basis; and two-thirds of the projects for which grants have been made have been for sewage-disposal plants or waterworks extension plants.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on that point, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Mississippi is absolutely correct.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his verification.

That means that these essential and most necessary improvements are made in villages, small towns, and small cities. However, they are expensive improvements; and the local governments could not by themselves finance them; neither do they have the ability to borrow sufficient funds with which to meet this need.

So, insofar as many of the villages, small towns, and small cities are concerned, this program doubtless represents the difference between being able or being unable to go forward, rather than gradually fall back and fall out of the economy. I believe this is one of the most appealing virtues and one of the proven, demonstrated qualities which the program has already shown. That fact in itself certainly justifies such a program.

I regret that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has seen fit to offer his amendment to the committee amendment. His amendment calls for a small reduction. I hope the judgment of the committee that his amendment should be rejected and that the committee amendment should be confirmed will—entirely on the merits of the case—be sustained. In the committee, I did not hear any real objection to the amount or to the program itself; and I think the judgment of the committee should stand.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, this appropriation will add to the national deficit during the next fiscal year. So will tax reduction. So will other appropriations which will come before the Senate.

I was interested to hear the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] express his support of the bill. I, too, support it; but I do not close my eyes to the fact that it will add to the deficit.

Yesterday, during debate, the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] said that jobs for 250,000 people are involved in the bill. I do not know by what index that particular number is arrived at. However, assuming it to be a correct estimate, I ask this question: Could a tax reduction of $450 million, thereby adding that amount to the deficit, possibly provide as much employment for the unemployed as the pending bill will provide?

It seems to me that the earnest desire of those who are unemployed may be that they become taxpayers. They are not particularly concerned with a tax cut. Instead, they wish to be able to pay some taxes—in other words, to earn income on which they will owe taxes. So they need, not a tax cut, but jobs.

I share the views which have been expressed about the value of this program and the need for this appropriation. If we must have deficit financing, I choose the kind of deficit by which we shall get something for our money. For the deficit spending contained in the pending bill, we shall have improvements in water facilities and a lessening of the pollution of our streams and of the water table; and we shall also have, to show for the deficit, investments in other community improvements. If our way of life is affluent, if it affords healthful living conditions and opportunities for employment and education, these must be available on the community level.

Theories in Washington are not very valuable unless they are given effect and meaning in the communities throughout our land.

I oppose the pending amendment, support the bill, and only regret that the entire amount requested will not be appropriated. I express the hope that further authorization will be enacted this year.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, what is the time situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has 23 minutes remaining and the Senator from Rhode Island has 21 minutes remaining.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I assign 3 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, yesterday I spoke in opposition to the amendment offered by my friend the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. Today I again express my opposition to the amendment. I oppose the reduction of the appropriation from $450 million to $250 million because I believe the entire sum is needed to meet the essential purpose of the program. Let us remember that the essential purpose of the program is to provide employment to people living in areas of persistent unemployment, and to those who have been out of work for long periods of time. I agree that a public works program is not the best method of insuring and providing full employment throughout the country. And in time a tax cut will

hopefully, stimulate both the economy and employment. But the question I raised yesterday, and the one I repeat today, is what is being done to provide opportunity for the hard core of unemployed people while we wait for a tax cut, investment, and the natural processes of private enterprise to stimulate the economy? As the Senator from Massachusetts has said, it is true that this appropriation and the public works program it supports, will not furnish employment to every unemployed person, and to certain categories of labor. But there are other groups of people for whom it would provide employment.

I could be charged with having an interest because my State is grievously affected by a lagging economy in its coal fields. And I am concerned with the fact that many are out of work in my State, and that their families are suffering. But I do not base my support of the works program, and my opposition to the amendment on parochial grounds. I believe the Congress has the duty, and the responsibility, to consider the plight of those who are unemployed through no fault of their own—wherever they may live in our country. And I believe it is the responsibility of the Congress to provide every reasonable help for their emergency employment until the economy begins to grow at a faster pace.

I can support reductions in the budget in many fields; I shall do so, and I believe $3–$4 billion can be cut. But I do not desire to make my plea for economy at the expense of the people in our country who are out of work—and I do not want to cut out the one available program which offers hope for emergency employment. The emergency public works program to which we are addressing ourselves will provide substantial benefits and improvements *throughout* the country in many communities—sewage and water facilities, hospitals, and public buildings. But its chief purpose is to give employment. Mr. William Batt, the Director of the program, testified that the addition of this $450 million would mean that the total overall employment generated by this program will be from 225,000 to 250,000 jobs averaging 1 year of work. This is no small achievement.

I support the measures that we can take—a tax cut accompanied by reductions in spending—to achieve fiscal stability and to stimulate the economy. And I voice my own political philosophy in saying that our country, the Congress, and my party have responsibility to people who are out of work and cannot find jobs, while we, and, more important, they, are waiting for the economy to improve.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. I assign 1 additional minute to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator two questions which are important to me.

Those of us who advocate a tax cut and many other things to improve the economy and deal with endemic unemployment must take account of the interim period in which those measures will not have been effectuated. Is that not true?

Mr. COOPER. That is what I have argued. There will be an interim period of at least a year or two.

Mr. JAVITS. In the view of the Senator from Kentucky, is the program designed to fill that void?

Mr. COOPER. I support it as having that purpose.

Mr. JAVITS. Second, does the Senator feel that we have already made the cut in the authorization? I and others, including the Senator from Kentucky, I am sure, voted to cut the proposal for an appropriation of $2 billion down to an appropriation for $900 million. So what we are asked to appropriate now is within the context of what we have already cut. Is that correct?

Mr. COOPER. That is correct, following the action last summer in fixing the authorization at $900 million.

Mr. JAVITS. I appreciate that. I find my own view is parallel to that of the Senator. An exercise of responsibility requires that we go at least that far.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I never cease to be beguiled by the language of the appropriation bills that come to the floor of the House and the Senate. In fact, during the 17 or 18 years that I have served either on the House Appropriations Committee or the Senate Appropriations Committee I have been beguiled because all bills start in the same fashion. They provide that—

> The following sums are appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supplemental appropriations—

And so forth. The language includes, "out of any money in the Treasury."

Mr. President, on net balance there is no money in the Treasury. Certainly when the books are cast up and we are given an accounting for the fiscal year 1962–63, which will come on the 30th of next month, we will see that the deficit will aggregate as much as $9 billion. But I am now speaking of net balance. We can exercise all the abracadabra we desire, we can borrow, we can set up a complicated system of bookkeeping, but when all is said and done, there is no money in the Treasury out of which the sum proposed can be expended. The money will be borrowed money. We can slice the baloney any way we desire; it will be borrowed money, and there will be a debt service on it from now on.

All anyone need do is to look at the unexpurgated edition of the Federal budget, which looks like an 8-pound Sears Roebuck catalog, and there he will find that interest on the public debt is in the $10 billion bracket. Every time we add to the debt, the interest charge goes up.

I am not insensible of the fact that our country is a growing country. But I am also not insensible of the fact that the interest alone on the public debt is 2½ times the whole cost of the Government—including Army, Navy, and civil functions of all kinds—the year I landed in this town as a freshman Representative in 1933.

Today we have a debt well in excess of $300 billion.

I do not care about the hocus-pocus I have read in the newspapers that the administration proposes to exercise. We are told that the Department of the Treasury will ask to raise the debt ceiling to $320 billion. We are told that they have some kind of scheme now to make it appear to be what it actually is not.

I am reminded a little of that sweet gracious old lady who hired a man to bring together the family genealogy. Unfortunately they found one uncle on the family tree who had been electrocuted in the penitentiary. To make sure that he would command a good fee, the genealogical expert, while puzzling about it, finally said, "There was one uncle who occupied the chair of applied electricity in a large public institution."

That is a wonderful way to put it, but it meant exactly what it was; that he had committed a crime and was electrocuted for it to pay his debt to society.

So I do not care about the fancy words and trappings. This is borrowed money, and we ought to be very careful how we spend it.

Last September the Senate passed the authorization bill. They wanted $2 billion, as the distinguished Senator from New York said. How true. We cut that to $900 million.

Do Senators think they will not be back? Do not be so foolish, because they are back now for the other $500 million we did not give them when we passed the appropriation bill in October of last year. The bill went to the White House for signature. I suppose there were some naive souls who thought, "We will give them $400 million, and perhaps, because of some magic gesture they will not come back." But they are here.

That was last October. This is May. The bill is here. They wanted not a part of it, but all of it, until the House cut out $50 million. So their request was for $500 million, to make up the total of $900 million. Originally it was $2 billion. If we give this to them, then we can wait to see whether they will be back for the remainder of what they want, to be added to the debt.

I noticed with interest what the Secretary of the Treasury said to the chamber of commerce yesterday that there was an upswing and the possibility of generating another billion dollars in taxes. Bless him if it can be done. I only hope so. But I have my fingers crossed, because, when all is said and done, there are only two jobmakers in the country. One is government. The other is enterprise. I do not care how anyone slices that, we cannot get away from it.

The administration takes credit now for having provided some jobs. There are 690,000 more people now working on

the State and local payrolls, paid for out of taxes; 126,000 more people on the Federal Government payroll; and 192,000 more persons in the Armed Forces since the Kennedy administration came into power; or more than 1 million more persons receiving their pay through taxes levied on our people. Do Senators call it job giving to take it out of one pocket and put it in another? I suppose that is the reason why there is lack of the rather delicate thing which is called "confidence," which is so necessary to energize and stimulate a country. I do not think the people who have the money for capital investment think this is a correct way to operate a railroad. That is the simple truth.

Confidence is a delicate thing, Mr. President. I am reminded of the lady who got up in the car on the train and walked from one car to another. When she was in the vestibule, between cars, the bell cord snapped and hit her on the cheek. At that time the conductor came by, and she said, "My conscience, what happened?" He said, "Lady, be calm. The train pulled in two." She said, "Is it any wonder? Could you hold it together with a piece of string?"

But that is the piece of string which made this country go, and it will make it go again. We are making it more difficult to make it go. That is what bothers me.

They are here again. They wanted $500 million. The House gave them $450 million. Now we are trying to cut the figure back, by the amendment, $200 million.

I could give Senators all the details in the hearings. I read every word. I read the House hearings. What do Senators think they say? The applications coming into the Housing and Home Finance Agency are running $300 million a month. Those coming to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are running $150 million a month. That is a total of $450 million a month. If we multiply by 12, if that is a consistent pattern, there would be $5.4 billion in applications in a year.

I say, "Is anybody so naive as to believe that this will be the end of this business? Do not kid yourselves."

The hearings show that 6,211 projects were submitted. That covers only three-fourths of the distressed areas, 900 areas out of more than 1,200 areas.

What do Senators think the towns and villages in other areas will do? Do Senators think they will let this grab bag go by without getting their share?

I say to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], "Do you, sir, think that will happen in New Hampshire?" The Senator knows very well that those who did not get their applications in in time will come to the Congress. They will be on his doorstep. They will say to the Senator from New Hampshire, "Senator COTTON, we could not get down there in time with our tincups. We want you now to see that more money is authorized and that more is appropriated. We have to get into this deal."

And they will get into it. We cannot cut off a Federal function like this so easily, with so much money involved.

I know that the majority of projects are for sewers and paving, but there are projects for city halls, too, and for courthouses and for fire stations.

I served for 4 years on a city council, and I know how eager we were to have a city hall. But there was no Mr. Whiskers, better known as Uncle Sam, from whom to get the money. But we finally got a city hall with our own money. We got a courthouse with our own money. And we got a fire station with our own money.

When the people in my town were interested in sewage treatment, I said, "Yes; that must be done. You cannot pour raw effluence into a wonderful river that once upon a time was next to the Columbia River as a fish-producing stream." It broke my heart to see that river contaminated. I helped to carry the ball. My twin brother got into the council, and he helped to carry it. We got a sewage treatment plant.

But, it is said, "Here is free money. Get your hands into the sack." My State is in it for $10 million. The people will not like the speech I make on the Senate floor today, but I have to make it, because there is something more important than a little plant for one of my own towns, and that is the solvency of the United States of America in a day of fever, when countries are foundering in our own hemisphere. Look at Brazil. The cruzeiro went down, I understand, 64 percent in a single month. The Argentine is in danger. There is the problem of Cuba, and many other things. This becomes a taint. It becomes a contagion. It becomes an infection in that part of the world where we live.

Oh, how blithely we discuss this matter and say, "This is a good thing." It is transient. There is talk of 220,000 jobs, about half on-site, and about half off-site, for $900 million. That is what the record shows. I do not believe those figures, Mr. President.

I have great admiration for Mr. Batt, the Administrator.

Incidentally, with respect to the "crocodile" discussion yesterday, when the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] thought the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] had called him a crocodile, I wish to say that he did not call him a crocodile. He was only talking about crocodile tears. But the Senator from Pennsylvania should not shed any crocodile tears, because, if Senators will note the hearings, they will see that the great and good Keystone State will get $31½ million. The limit is 10 percent, and out of $367 million Pennsylvania will get pretty close to 10 percent. They got the Administrator, too, and the Assistant Administrator. So the Senator from Pennsylvania should shed no crocodile tears. He is doing very well under this program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the other day I saw that we were about to observe the anniversary of a rather interesting flight made by a young gentleman named Corrigan. It happened many years ago. He started from New York to California, but, as I understand, he landed in Dublin, Ireland; and they have called him Wrong Way Corrigan from that day to this.

If that is the way to get the country "moving," all I have to say is we are moving in the wrong direction. We are ballooning the debt. The Senator from New Hampshire knows this. We are ballooning the budget. It is not $99 billion. It is $108 billion. Let us be honest with the people. There are $9 billion of new functions and obligations in the budget, in addition to the $99 billion in administrative cash. Then there is a proposal for a $12 billion deficit in 1964. Then, in addition, a tax cut is proposed.

That is why there is a certain euphemism to the language in the appropriation bills that begins, "The following sums are appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

The money is not there. It is like the ditty I heard again the other day:

> Last night I saw upon the stair
> A little man who wasn't there.
> He wasn't there again today.
> Oh, how I wish he'd go away.

I am thinking in terms of the solvency of our country. I do not go for all the figures that are so neatly racked up. Mention is made of 220,000 jobs. How much of this is machine work? For many years I was involved in earth machinery contracting work. The book says this is competitive work. If I bid on one of those jobs, all I do is move my machines over to another site. The same manpower, is used. The talk about how many jobs will be created is sheer guesswork. Some jobs will be created. In the very nature of things, that could not be helped. But to say that for one man on-site one man off-site will be put to work is guesswork. What is there in the way of inventory of cast iron pipe for water mains, for example? There is plenty there. The jobs for that particular kind of work are not particularly multiplied. So I take all of these figures with a grain of salt.

I wish we could send out through the country a note of confidence and say that we are going to cooperate with those forces and with the basic philosophical approaches to prosperity that have always worked before.

There is bound to be some pain. No baby was ever born into the world without some pain and travail. We do not get out of fixes and difficulties without some pain. This was referred to as the interim period. There are painful periods, to be sure, but is that an excuse for piling mistake upon mistake and failure to sound forth a position that is best calculated to undergird with confidence the economic structure of the country so that we can really get moving again?

Mr. President, mine may be only a voice in the wilderness, but this has to be said. In that connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table which appears on page 477 of the hearings, which is a summary

by States of projects approved under the $400 million accelerated public works appropriation as of March 31, 1963.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary by States of projects approved under $400,000,000 accelerated public works appropriation as of Mar. 31, 1963

[Dollars in thousands]

State	Accelerated public works funds	Other Federal funds [1]	Local matching funds [2]	Estimated on-site man-years
Alabama	$9,446		$7,830	1,293
Alaska	4,626	$43	2,167	346
Arizona	5,170		150	755
Arkansas	5,765	308	4,405	766
California	14,410	250	8,995	1,410
Colorado	2,535	255	1,522	339
Connecticut	4,237	272	4,545	570
Delaware	319		666	31
Florida	6,499		6,115	784
Georgia	6,615		5,235	828
Hawaii	546			91
Idaho	3,606	103	258	401
Illinois	10,634	489	8,004	1,127
Indiana	4,924	566	5,070	571
Iowa	385			21
Kansas	552		730	87
Kentucky	16,447	1,325	17,003	2,830
Louisiana	14,111	1,775	18,810	2,196
Maine	2,426	1,103	2,109	357
Maryland	1,539		842	189
Massachusetts	6,199	609	7,901	715
Michigan	30,958	2,386	25,783	3,368
Minnesota	7,061	735	6,287	823
Mississippi	7,215	317	5,297	1,336
Missouri	5,975		2,866	761
Montana	3,516		263	525
Nebraska	1,337	129	854	124
Nevada	332		66	50
New Hampshire	1,129	504	1,233	102
New Jersey	21,137	1,913	23,141	2,226
New Mexico	8,001	179	1,123	1,191
New York	11,642	805	11,422	1,212
North Carolina	8,988	229	6,089	1,469
North Dakota	497		65	83
Ohio	11,671	896	12,699	1,212
Oklahoma	7,888	35	5,144	833
Oregon	6,479		1,909	917
Pennsylvania	31,502		28,338	3,929
Rhode Island	6,799	1,692	8,007	541
South Carolina	6,094	295	7,754	768
South Dakota	1,139		240	191
Tennessee	10,542	99	10,368	1,832
Texas	9,602	38	8,790	1,211
Utah	3,503		575	558
Vermont	391	549	932	34
Virginia	1,461	236	787	252
Washington	8,389	6	4,309	834
West Virginia	16,932	610	12,017	1,936
Wisconsin	3,917	747	2,738	521
Wyoming	827	58	592	141
Guam	105			11
Puerto Rico	11,422	243	5,854	1,136
Virgin Islands	326			72
U.S. total	367,768	19,799	296,899	45,906

[1] Consists of grants made under the Hill-Burton hospital program and the water pollution program.
[2] Consists of moneys provided by the localities for hospital, water pollution, and local water, sewer, and other public facilities.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, some time later it will probably be my pleasure to submit another table showing how the $450 million is to be disposed of, unless the Senate, in its profound wisdom, is willing to support the Saltonstall amendment. I wish it would. I hope it will. But I do not let my hopes deceive me to the point where I think that objective is going to be consummated.

That is the story, Mr. President; but on this whole issue of economy, other things will be said, and I know there are those who do not share my view. However, that is the glory of this great deliberative body, where we can speak out, contrary to views of others of our colleagues, and be cheerful about it.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the majority leader.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the remaining amendments and all amendments thereto, as well as motions, there be a time limitation of 40 minutes, 20 minutes to the side, this agreement to apply only to the amendments and motions, and not to the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, this proposal applies to all amendments at the desk, without regard to the rule of germaneness. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That, during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5517) the supplemental appropriation bill, 1963, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 40 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I understand the majority leader has an official commitment to keep.

May I ask how much time we have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventeen minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, for 8 years the junior Senator from Louisiana has been voting against the foreign aid bill, not because he found it difficult to justify some sort of foreign aid, but because he thought there had been waste and extravagance in the aid program. The most appealing argument that could be made for the foreign aid bill is that we are helping people help themselves all over the world, whether they are friendly, or neutral, or even enemies. We have appropriated billions of dollars for foreign aid, hundreds of millions of dollars going to countries dedicated to the defeat of the cause for which this country stands. The junior Senator from Louisiana has felt that he should not vote for such wasteful expenditures.

In this case, the administration is pledged to see that our own people are put to work. We have altogether too much unemployment. Undoubtedly, in the next election campaign, Republicans will hold the Democrats responsible for every man who is out of work and who is desirous of obtaining work that will be beneficial to himself and to his community.

We are proposing to help areas that are depressed, where there is a great deal of unemployment, to help themselves. They will match the funds we appropriate. They will put up their own money to match such funds. In my own State, there are 78 such communities that have made application to participate in this program. All of them have a high degree of unemployment. They want to put up their own money to help themselves. They want the Federal Government to cooperate in a continuing program.

I will vote to help such communities to help themselves to provide sewerage facilities, water services, sewage treatment plants, hospitals, and other desirable public works. It will both reduce unemployment and permanently improve the communities involved.

This is a much better program, in my view, than giving millions of dollars to foreign countries, or lending money to them, with repayment to no one but themselves.

How any Senator can proceed to vote against this kind of help for people of his own country who need help, people who want help themselves, and people who want to put up their share of the expenditure in an effort to relieve the recession that we are in, Americans who want to improve the welfare of their communities and their country as a whole, and then proceed to vote a high figure of expenditure for foreign aid, and even provide aid to Communist coun-

tries, is something that I cannot understand.

I will vote to help Americans help themselves.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the arguments for making available without delay the $450 million already authorized under the accelerated public works program are many and convincing.

As my colleagues know, I have supported this program from its inception. Indeed, in years previous, I, along with other Members of this body have proposed legislation to accomplish the same beneficial purposes as the accelerated public works program, with emphasis on job producing, community building, sewer, water, hospital, airport, and other projects.

It is with a feeling of gratification that I find the Senate today considering the appropriation of an additional $450 million for the public works program. This amount, coupled with the $400 million appropriated last year will go a long way toward achieving the goals which I, and many of my colleagues, have sought for many years to raise the standards of living in the many small towns, villages, and the larger municipalities of Tennessee.

The Senate is called upon today to approve funds which to my way of thinking will be in the nature of a final culmination to many years of work which I have had the pleasure and privilege of carrying on.

I recall that almost 6 years ago to the day, we were debating here the Community Facilities Act of 1958, of which I was a cosponsor, which would have expanded the public facility loan program of the Community Facilities Administration to accomplish the same aims as the program we debate today, more employment and better communities. At the same time, over 6 years ago, I placed in the RECORD voluminous correspondence from mayors and county officials from Tennessee who had written me concerning their vital interest in public works improvements for their areas. From Chattanooga in the south to Bristol in the northeast and across the State all the way to Memphis, I received statements of the vast need and the increasing interest of the leading citizens of my State in a program of Federal aid for public works improvements. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 15, 1958, I inserted over 60 letters I had received from local officials pointing out their need for sewer, water, and other public works programs. The letters came from all over Tennessee, from every size community. We made a determined effort at that time to secure passage of legislation authorizing $2 billion for low-interest loans to provide a sound fiscal structure for the improvement of the physical plants of our local communities. I also recall that I calculated at that time that there were approximately $70 million worth of projects in Tennessee alone which were ready and needful of Federal assistance.

The basis of need was the same then and now, great unemployment and a lack of basic public utilities to guarantee the heath, safety, and comfort of our people. Of course, I do not have to tell the Senate that the problem is even greater today than it was when we argued the pros and cons of Federal aid to local communities in 1958. Population has expanded at a rate that is accurately described as the "population explosion." There are consequently millions of additional Americans who need the services of local public facilities, particularly in our small communities where water and sewage disposal facilities may be most primitive and unsatisfactory.

Mr. President, again in 1959, I was happy to support legislation to expand the loan program of the Community Facilities Administration. I recall in April of that year the executive secretary of the Tennessee Municipal League testified before the Senate Banking Committee that there was an enormous backlog of projects in Tennessee which needed immediate attention, and could only be helped by low interest Government loans, since these localities had dangerously high municipal indebtedness. The estimate at that time for the need of funding in Tennessee alone was $180 million. Consequently, Mr. President, if we approve the $450 million today, and it is added to the $400 million already invested in the accelerated public works program, it will help the problem and the needs of our people, but will not fully satisfy it. This is true, because of the enormous backlog of projects waiting for attention, and I am sure every Senator knows how extensive this backlog is in his home State.

Turning from the needs of the past to the needs of the present, I note that a great number of projects are either already approved for Tennessee or are being processed at the present time.

Among those already approved are airport facilities and a fire hall at Chattanooga, a courthouse for Bradley County, water systems for Smith County, and the cities of Jasper, Alexandria, Vanleer, and Springfield; sewer facilities for Cocke County, Cookeville, Morristown, and East Ridge; sewer and water facilities for Monterey, Camden, and Livingston; and college housing for the University of Tennessee.

Additionally, there are almost a hundred projects pending consideration from practically every community in Tennessee, and I am certainly hopeful that these people and these communities will not be disappointed, but that their needs for facilities to make their communities better places to live will be satisfied through the appropriation we are considering today. These programs for which we are considering approval of funds will attract industry to needy communities, increase employment, and meet the health, welfare, and safety needs of our people. As one who has been interested in Federal assistance for community facilities for many, many years, I urge the Senate to approve this $450 million for the accelerated public works program and keep this important program moving right ahead.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDMONDSON in the chair). All remaining time has been yielded back. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the Saltonstall amendment. The question is on agreeing to that amendment. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay," and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is absent on official business as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Air Force Academy.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea" and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 60, as follows:

[No. 64 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Allott	Jordan, Idaho	Saltonstall
Boggs	Kuchel	Simpson
Byrd, Va.	Lausche	Smith
Carlson	McClellan	Thurmond
Cotton	Mechem	Tower
Curtis	Morton	Williams, Del.
Dirksen	Mundt	Young, N. Dak.
Dominick	Pearson	

NAYS—60

Anderson	Gruening	McNamara
Bartlett	Hart	Monroney
Bayh	Hayden	Morse
Beall	Hill	Moss
Brewster	Holland	Muskie
Burdick	Humphrey	Nelson
Byrd, W. Va.	Inouye	Pastore
Case	Jackson	Pell
Church	Javits	Proxmire
Clark	Johnston	Randolph
Cooper	Jordan, N.C.	Ribicoff
Dodd	Keating	Russell
Douglas	Kefauver	Scott
Eastland	Kennedy	Smathers
Edmondson	Long, Mo.	Sparkman
Ellender	Long, La.	Stennis
Engle	Mansfield	Symington
Ervin	McCarthy	Talmadge
Fong	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Gore	McIntyre	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—14

Bennett	Hartke	Miller
Bible	Hruska	Neuberger
Cannon	Magnuson	Prouty
Fulbright	McGee	Yarborough
Goldwater	Metcalf	

So Mr. SALTONSTALL's amendment was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS—"EXECUTIVE EXCESS"

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], who is absent on official business, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on the subject of accelerated public works, dealing with "Executive excess."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HRUSKA

The $450 million supplemental appropriation for a second round of so-called accelerated public works is a further case of an Executive excess by an administration responsible only to its own notions of milking real economic distress for all its political potential. It is another invitation for Congress to abdicate our obligation and our authority in our constitutional system of balanced power, simply to let the administration who "always knows best" have its way, outside the traditional framework of legislative authorization review.

We have before us this request for a $450 million supplemental appropriation, to support another year of so-called accelerated public works. But these are public works with a difference, a big and dangerous difference. These projects are allocated at executive discretion, in areas defined by formulas of almost infinite flexibility and subject only to Executive fiat, funded and controlled as the Executive sees fit, all put forward in the name of relief that may not be effective, for an emergency that may not exist.

Let's not delude ourselves: the bill of $400 million was big enough last year; the supplemental is bigger still; and if experience is any guide, this is only the beginning. Indeed, this whole operation got underway as the direct result of a request for fully $2 billion in "standby" presidential authority, rationalized as an antirecession measure but utterly uncontrolled and entirely outside the limits of detailed congressional authorization and, thus, of effective control.

Is this Nation in fact in the grip of so grave an economic crisis as might conceivably justify another installment in this crash program? If it is, and I do not for one moment, subscribe to any such assumption, does this accelerated public works program provide anything more permanent than short-term relief, if that much? Is it really enough, or just sufficient to provide some useful political pressure in widely scattered marginal constituencies? Is it a way toward lasting solutions for persistent unemployment, or simply an avenue for the dispensation of Executive patronage and partisan preferences?

These are hard questions. They are questions neither the deficit-ridden American taxpayer nor any conscientious Senator can afford to shunt aside. If the answers are satisfactory, well and good. If they are not, then let us fulfill our obligations.

We are told that these public works will generate the equivalent of 100,000 to 120,000 man-years of work and new payrolls of nearly a billion dollars, adding in the State and local matching grants for area redevelopment projects. But at best, this amounts only to a drop in a bucket, about a 2-percent drop in a 5-million-man bucket. And once this money is spent—about half of it for off-the-shelf hardware and not for payrolls at all—what then? Have new skills been created? Have men been trained for permanent jobs in developing labor markets? Once this year's accumulation of projects has been built, what have we to show for our investment, except an ever-mounting burden of debt on generations still to come?

We are told that this program will produce new and valuable community facilities in areas currently depressed. I must note that at least one of the so-called depressed counties in my State is actually one of the most prosperous rural counties in America. But even if the purpose is worth while, then let us by all means argue the matter on its true merits. Why attempt to justify it on trumped-up grounds of emergency relief? Let us, in that case, subject the proposal to calm and deliberate project-by-project analysis, within the traditional framework of Executive proposal and legislative disposal of legitimate public business. Why have we abandoned the traditional procedure in favor of sole Executive discretion? There is before the Senate right now a request for fully $1.7 billion in public works. Let us subject these emergency projects to the same careful scrutiny of our Public Works Committee and decide each case on its merits.

We are not told, except by the evidence of our own eyes and ears and by reports of vigorous armtwisting on the other side of the Capitol of the lengths to which this administration is evidently prepared to go to pressure this program through the Congress. Why, for example, did a district-by-district breakdown, dated March 1, suddenly appear in the halls of the Capitol on April 9 and 10, itemizing favors dispensed and favors promised—a sort of analysis of the futures market in public works? Why the sudden rush of phone calls and wires and special emissaries from State and local officials, and the crude attempt to wrap this program in the mantle of welfare for the needy and aid for the downtrodden?

We are not told, in all the glowing statistics of jobs created, that as of mid-February every single man-year of "made" work represented a governmental outlay of nearly $10,000. Even using the projections for the whole program the cost per job is about $8,200. And that is only the average. The cost per job for one Forest Service project in Alabama was a fantastic $250,000, for "recreational facilities," mind you; for a "land treatment" project in Arkansas, $96,000; and for yet another Alabama "recreational facility," $132,000. At this rate, one of our hardworking and hardheaded colleagues in the other body calculated it would cost at least 30 billions of tax dollars to whip the unemployment problem nationwide.

But that is precisely the point, of course. This is no proper or effective attack on joblessness at all. What is needed, clearly, is stepped-up private capital investment which alone will generate new jobs, jobs that are permanent and that improve the quality of our labor force. What is needed is a business climate based on confidence, on respect for creative enterprise, and on just rewards for risk and initiative. Adding $450 million to a projected budget deficit of $10 or $12 billion is hardly a contribution to a dynamic free economy; this program amounts to a hobble rather than a spur. It is our responsibility and our opportunity to label it for what it is, not what the press agents of executive excess claim it to be.

It is an open invasion of congressional prerogatives. It is not an effective attack on the national problem of persistent joblessness. And it is not a contribution to fiscal sobriety or to business confidence, which alone provide the dynamic spark in a free market economy.

One of our national news magazines, in a cynical account of the pressure politics that revived this program in the other body after an initially unfavorable committee vote, put it this way: "Since when have politicians started voting against the pork barrel?"

The Senate of the United States has all the opportunity it needs to work its will on Government economy and on policies of sound fiscal management. Right here, with this bill, there is both the opportunity and the challenge to restore some measure of balanced good order to our constitutional system.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without losing the floor, I may yield to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], to call up another amendment, subject to the limitation of time which has been agreed to on my amendment No. 67, which I now propose to call up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not object, provided I am allowed time to respond.

Mr. JAVITS. That is understood.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, and ask to have considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, lines 3 and 4, it is proposed to strike out "to remain available until June 30, 1964," and insert in lieu thereof, "to remain available until January 31, 1964."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I understand the amendment is acceptable to the Senator from Rhode Island, who is in charge of the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who is chairman of the subcommittee which handles public works appropriations, and also after consultation with the agencies involved, we have reached the conclusion that in the interest of saving time and expediting the passage of the bill January 31, 1964, would be a convenient date. I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield back the rest of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a number of Senators wish to leave the Chamber to attend to other duties. I expect to speak for about 15 minutes on my amendment. I now call up my amendment numbered 67, as modified, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 11, before the period it is proposed to insert the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of such additional amount shall be used in any State in which the participants in, or beneficiaries of, the programs of the Farmers Home Administration are segregated, or otherwise discriminated against, on account of race, creed, or color".

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Rhode Island. Twenty minutes are available to me on my amendment, and I intend to use perhaps all of that amount of time. My colleague [Mr. KEATING] needs 5 minutes, and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] needs 1 minute. Will the Senator from Rhode Island yield that much time to them, so that I may use all the time available to me?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. President, I believe that at the beginning of the debate on this amendment it should be stated that a motion to lay the amendment on the table will be made. So the opposition to the amendment will be in a position to yield back some time.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to my amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at this time will the Senator from Rhode Island yield 5 minutes to my colleague [Mr. KEATING]?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, who has charge of the time?

Mr. JAVITS. I have control of the time available to those who support my amendment. But I wonder whether the Senator from Rhode Island will yield 5 minutes to my colleague [Mr. KEATING] and 1 minute to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. President, at this time I yield 1 minute to the Senator from West Virginia.

RURAL HOUSING LOANS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President there could conceivably be a misunderstanding of the statement pertaining to rural housing loans, on page 4 of Senate Report 155 relating to supplemental appropriations for 1963. It could possibly cause some confusion and also overlapping of responsibility between two Federal Government agencies. I refer to the committee's action which would direct "the Secretary of Agriculture to make available immediately necessary loan funds, in addition to those allocated under the regular program, to meet the urgent needs of qualified applicants who have been affected by such local disasters," having reference to rural homes damaged in recent weeks "from floods and fire."

I call to the attention of the manager of the bill, my cherished colleague [Mr. PASTORE] and to the Senate the fact that the Small Business Administration has for several years had a disaster loan program that covers homes and other properties—other than farmers'—damaged "from floods and fire." The program of the Small Business Administration covers those who receive most of their income from operations other than farm operations, irrespective of the size of the community. Moreover, I stress that this program has been administered very vigorously, and has in many areas of the country enabled people whose properties have been damaged to restore fully such properties. I make particular reference to the disaster last year on the east coast of this country, including New Jersey, North Carolina, Virginia, Delaware, Maryland, and New York. Presently the Small Business Administration has special disaster offices in rural areas in West Virginia and Kentucky.

In a measure, then, Mr. President, the direction given the Secretary of Agriculture could duplicate the authority already vested in the Small Business Administration, and the effect would be that two agencies would be making loans to the same kind of applicants. This, of course, could be very perplexing to residents of rural areas and small towns throughout the country.

So I should like to have a clarification, for I am sure it was not intended to have overlapping activities by the agencies now engaged in this worthwhile work, inasmuch as the Small Business Administration has been very effective. Therefore, I wish to have an assurance that there is no desire on the part of the committee, let us say, to lessen the efforts of the Small Business Administration in this field.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from West Virginia is absolutely correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at this time will the Senator from Rhode Island yield 5 minutes to my colleague [Mr. KEATING]?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes, Mr. President; I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

SUPPORT FOR NONDISCRIMINATION AMENDMENT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this amendment deals with only one Federal program, a program of assistance to farmers administered by the Farmers Home Administration. It is only one of dozens of amendments which would be needed to conform every Federal activity to the equal protection requirements of the Constitution. I support this amendment, as I would any other designed to prohibit Federal subsidies for Jim Crow projects.

This subject takes on added significance in view of the recent report of the Commission on Civil Rights on the status of the equal protection of the laws in Mississippi.

A number of observers expressed their shock at what they considered the extreme recommendations of the Commission.

In my judgment, anyone who has read the Commission's report should be far more shocked by the conditions it exposed than by its recommendations for remedial action.

In the Commission's words:

> Citizens of the United States have been shot, set upon by vicious dogs, beaten, and otherwise terrorized because they sought to vote. * * * Even children, at the brink of starvation, have been deprived of assistance by the callous and discriminatory acts of Mississippi officials administering Federal funds.

If such conduct does not affront the conscience of the Nation, as the Commission assumed it would, then the Nation certainly needs to engage in some solemn soul searching.

Last year, the residents of States in which constitutional rights are openly flouted received billions in Federal tax funds under various Federal programs. This is several times more than the people in these States contributed to the Federal Treasury. What the Commission recommended was that the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government inquire into the moral and legal considerations arising out of a situation where the lawless conduct and defiance of the Constitution by certain elements in one State are being subsidized by the other States.

This recommendation of the Civil Rights Commission was not the recommendation of an extremist group; instead, it was the thoughtful and unanimous judgment of six outstanding Americans representing every phase of our national life: Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, the president of Notre Dame University; Robert G. Storey, the former dean of the Southern Methodist University Law School; John A. Hannah, the president of Michigan State University; Robert S. Rankin, chairman of the Department of Political Science of Duke University; Spottswood W. Robinson III, dean of the Howard University Law School; and Erwin N. Griswold, dean of the Harvard University Law School. Their views deserve great respect. If their proposals appear to some to be extreme, it is not because of their lack of merit, but is because of the many years we have condoned the flagrant practices described not only in this report, but also in many other reports of the Civil Rights Commission.

These men who serve on the Commission have confronted discrimination not as an abstract philosophical proposition, but as a tragic challenge to every humane and liberal instinct. They have seen and heard the victims of such practices in face-to-face hearings. Their revulsion against conditions such as exist in Mississippi is not an impersonal expression of morality, but a deeply personal expression of outrage at the treatment to which some of our fellow Americans are subjected.

I have for many years protested the continued contribution of Federal tax funds to State programs and projects carried out on a discriminatory or segregated basis. It is ironical that the Department of Justice has initiated several lawsuits to prohibit just such practices despite the refusal of other Federal agencies to condition Federal grants on a policy of nondiscrimination.

No official sworn to uphold the law can ignore the Constitution in carrying out his authority. It is no more legal or moral for Federal agencies to spend Federal funds on unconstitutional projects than it is for State officials to subsidize white-only schools, parks, transportation, or other public facilities.

On several occasions many of us have requested the issuance of an Executive order to require all Federal agencies to insist upon uniform, nondiscriminatory Federal policies in connection with all Federal grants-in-aid. It seems to me that is the way to deal with this problem. If such an Executive order were issued, there would be no need to resort to such amendments to appropriation bills. But such an Executive order has not been issued; and the indications are that this recommendation of the Civil Rights Commission will not be implemented by Executive order.

Under the circumstances there is no alternative except to follow the course of the adoption of an amendment such as this one. Its provisions would bring this program into compliance with the Constitution. It should not be an affront to anyone, inasmuch as the amendment merely provides that Federal tax funds, which are taken out of the pockets and out of the pay envelopes of all our citizens, shall not be used in a way which violates the U.S. Constitution.

The Commission's report expresses a sentiment we all share in its statement that the Commission "does not want the people of Mississippi, either Negro or white, to lose benefits available to citizens of other States." Its goal, and the purpose behind amendments such as we are now considering, is rather "that all citizens in the United States be assured the full enjoyment of the rights guaranteed by the Constitution." In the words of the Commission:

> It is upon adherence to that great charter with its powerful moral premises that our survival as a free society depends.

Mr. President, this amendment would not discriminate against the people of Mississippi. It does not cut off funds to any State or any citizen. What it would do is assure that Federal funds under this program are not used in any part of the country to subsidize segregation. It asks only that those who receive Federal funds—collected from all our citizens without regard to their race—distribute them to the intended beneficiaries without regard to their race. In the simplest, but most compelling terms, it asks only that those who receive Federal funds comply with the Constitution. It discriminates against no State or group of citizens—but it does discriminate in favor of the Constitution and its guarantee of equal protection.

There is nothing shocking about this proposition. What is shocking, is that such a principle still needs to be established at this date in our history. What is even more shocking is the realization that our efforts today probably will be blocked by the same parliamentary devices and legalistic evasions which have doomed past efforts to breathe life into the fundamental law of our land.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 12 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 12 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this amendment is the beginning of a process which, unfortunately, may take a little time during this session of Congress and during this entire Congress. Nevertheless, this procedure must be followed. I say it is unfortunate that it may take a little time, because I believe there is growing among the Negroes in the United States an understandable and worrisome degree of frustration, in regard to the relatively slow progress in the legislative branch in dealing with many of the questions which must be dealt with legislatively in the field of race relations and civil rights. Negro writers, thinkers, and intellectuals, on the one hand, are expressing that kind of frustration and almost despair. I see movements such as that of the Black Muslims—which, incidentally, is being covered in a splendid series of articles being published in the New York Herald Tribune—which constitutes further evidence of the dangers involved. We also are familiar with evidences of violence, including the murder on a public highway of a fine man who was making an integration march; and we also have observed the disorders, requiring the presence of troops at Little Rock, Ark., and at Oxford, Miss., in addition to the shootings, the bombings, and the burnings. From all of these, one begins to appreciate that in this field we are not dealing with a tea party and that, unless an outlet is given for expression of the grievances in this field which men have felt for decades, our country will be in for a very difficult time.

What is being attempted with my amendments is to operate with the scalpel rather than a sword on every particular part of the Federal Establishment which is channeling money to the States, in instances in which the States use the money for purposes which either are themselves segregated or lend themselves to segregation.

Let us take the pending amendment as a practical example. The amendment is directed to the appropriation in the amount of $1,222,900 for the Farmers Home Administration. The Farmers Home Administration is a Federal agency which makes available loans to tenants, laborers, and sharecroppers for farm ownership. It makes available operating loans to farmers and stockmen. It also makes available soil and water conservation loans to farmers and associations. It makes available farm housing loans for construction and improvement of dwellings and other buildings. The Farmers Home Administration program is administered essentially through county committee, usually composed of three local farmers. It is they who decide who is or who is not entitled to credit. So far as can be ascertained by authoritative studies which have been made in the field there is no Negro member on any county committee anywhere in the United States.

Mr. President, the words "never" and "no" are always big words; so I am willing to say there might be one somewhere. I do not know. But so far as we have been able to find out, there are none.

A specific study upon this subject was recently made in South Carolina by the Southern Regional Council. It dealt with nine rural counties in that State: Allendale, Bamberg, Barnwell, Calhoun, Clarendon, Hampton, Jasper, Lee, and Williamsburg.

The study was made of counties in which Negroes constituted 50 percent of the total population. In eight of the counties, Negroes constituted more than 50 percent of the population. In none were Negro farmers less than 39 percent—roughly 40 percent—of the population. In those counties there was no county committee member who was a Negro.

Nevertheless it is the county committee members who determine who shall receive credit and who shall not.

We now know that one of the worst sanctions imposed upon—and one of the prime weapons used against—Negroes in the South who have the temerity to want to vote or get out in registration drives or show any signs whatever of being anything other than compliant citizens willing to stand by and see their

fundamental rights as Americans denied to them, is the denial of credit—an economic weapon, an economic sanction.

Also the system of white county committees lends itself to the system which is called in the South sponsorship. If a Negro does not have the sponsorship of some respectable and responsible white citizen in a community, he finds it very difficult to get a job, to get a loan, or to get along at all.

One can never implement situations of this character with the detailed application of farmer A on farm A who suffered this particular type of denial. The problem becomes fuzzy with questions as to whether the applicant's credit was good or bad, or whether he ought to be a farm owner or not. But I would like to give some figures for the RECORD from the recent study by the Southern Regional Council with respect to the nine rural counties in South Carolina.

Over the 3-year period ended June 30, 1962, only nine loans under Federal programs in the entire nine counties were made to Negroes for the purpose of enabling them to acquire their own farms. Five of the nine loans were made in fiscal year 1961.

Of loans either to build or to improve farm housing, only 14 loans were made to Negroes, 5 of those having been made also in fiscal year 1961.

Moreover, out of $1,222,630 advanced by the Farmers Home Administration for farm land acquisition in those counties—fundamental farm ownership—during that period, only $55,550 went to Negro families, and out of $1,328,915 advanced for farm housing, only $81,955 went to Negroes.

In short, in the first case, it was under 5 percent. In the second case it was under 7 percent. When we are dealing with a population juxtaposition in any of those counties, of not less than 40 percent, which the Negro farmer bears to the white and, as we very well know, the Negroes are frequently those who are most in need of loans——

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. My time is limited.

Mr. PASTORE. I will be happy to yield additional time.

Mr. JAVITS. I am happy to yield a minute to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I should like to ask the following question: How many Negroes in the counties of South Carolina to which the Senator has referred asked for loans and did not receive them?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have already said that I cannot testify as to that. In giving the facts and figures, I have said that one must draw a conclusion from the overall situation. I ask unanimous consent to include at this point table 4 of the Farmers Home Administration program for South Carolina giving for the years 1959, 1960, and 1961 operating loans, farm ownership loans, farm housing loans, soil and water conservation loans, and giving records for white and Negro applications received and loans made, so that it will be very clear, as I say to my colleague, what was applied for and what was granted.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE IV.—*Farmers Home Administration program for South Carolina*

Fiscal year	Operating loans				Farm ownership				Farm housing				Soil and water conservation			
	Applications received		Initial loans made		Applications received		Initial loans made		Applications received		Initial loans made		Applications received		Initial loans made	
	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro
1959	919	1,377	570	1,135	287	53	68	3	539	59	298	17	25	0	9	0
1960	773	929	516	670	292	63	76	12	354	47	158	15	36	0	21	0
1961	928	1,259	564	985	365	60	81	4	491	50	299	22	37	1	9	0

Mr. JAVITS. First, I base my argument on the fact that no Negroes are on the county committees which control that kind of credit, which is almost inconceivable when we are dealing with a county 42 percent of whose farmers are Negroes, unless there was a discriminatory pattern.

Second, I base my argument on the overall grant of credit for certain purposes, especially farm ownership, which shows again a complete and radical disproportion between the Negro and the white farmers in that particular set of counties and the figure on home ownership loans granted.

I point out that even the courts in similar situations are willing to accept that kind of evidence—not as conclusive, final, or determinative—but as evidence. That is the sense in which I submit it.

In view of those figures, it is beyond reasonable expectation that there should be other than some form of discriminatory pattern, unless an effort is made to come forward and explain why those figures are as heavily loaded as they are against Negro farmers.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Does the Senator from New York know how many loans made to white people went indirectly to colored people?

Mr. JAVITS. As I pointed out previously, I do not know that. I doubt very much whether anyone would know what loan money to white people went indirectly to colored people. But I point out again that that is a fundamental vice in the whole situation. The theory behind it is that the Negro is not an adult, an American citizen like the rest of us who, if he is entitled to a loan, is entitled to one. He does not have to get it through some channel or through the sponsorship of a white family in the community.

We are all beginning to understand the power of the economic sanction, which has contributed greatly to holding Negroes in subjection in the South.

I should like to make my fundamental thesis, if the Senator will allow me. My fundamental thesis is as follows: We should take an across-the-board position, as the U.S. Civil Rights Commission did in asking the President to cut off all Federal money to Mississippi. If we did that—and the facts indicate they did not—we would be asking the President to lay on with a broadsword, and whatever may have been the evils which Mississippi, by its intransigent position on this subject, has brought down on its head, one can understand—though one may not agree—why a President would not feel that he could do that. But I feel that to require every Government department to go through the list of its programs in detail and to see whether or not there is segregation within the programs for which the Federal Government is putting up the money to account for that to the Congress case by case and program by program is what the Federal Government ought to do and is its duty to do under the Constitution.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] and I have asked each Federal department, by specific letter questions, what is happening in each specific program based upon information that we have of segregation practices, program by program.

We have not yet heard from any Government department. I expect that we shall.

In the meantime, as the appropriation bills come before the Senate, I think it is our duty to pinpoint for the people of the country how the money is to be used. It is our duty to make this fight. This is, in my opinion, the way in which, at long last, we can begin to implement the constitutional guarantees.

I have pointed to our case. There is not a great deal of money involved. The money which is to be provided is $1,222,900, which is to be provided for salaries and expenses; but we all know that if an amendment such as this is adopted with respect to a routine appropriation of this character, as to which the derivative evidence is as crystal clear as it is in this case——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 more minutes.

I repeat, the evidence is crystal clear in this case. It is very clear both on the

basis of an example in a State and on the overall basis I have described.

Once we do anything like that, Mr. President—once we indicate that this will be the position of the Congress—then we shall not be dismayed by threats to the effect that "If you do this, the appropriation bill will be hung up forever."

Mr. President, the vote which was taken only a few minutes ago, on the Saltonstall amendment, which was 60 to 26, demonstrates that cloture could be effected if the Senate really had its teeth in a particular measure and felt it was high time to break this pattern of providing Federal money—money derived from taxes on all our citizens, white and black alike—for Federal programs which are segregated in character.

It seems to me that this would also go a long way toward making Negroes who today are so dangerously restless feel that they can get some safeguard and some measure of protection through the legislative process. This is elementary.

President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and President Truman—all great leaders—have agreed that if there is one area in which we ought to move, morally and constitutionally, it is in the area of not providing Federal money for programs which make a distinction as between black and white, as this program does, and as a whole series of programs do.

It is high time that this battle was fought. We may be beaten time and time again, Mr. President, but the reform will be made. It may not be by way of a legislative bill or amendment, but it will happen. This movement is absolutely glacial in character.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has again expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The only way we can make it happen, before we get into a great deal of trouble—and trouble is the alternative to these efforts to give justice and understanding in this whole problem—is to begin this fight in a specialized, detailed way, directing it to specific programs with specific amounts of money, as to which the evidence can be marshaled and controverted, if it can be.

I respect my friends from the South. I assume that either today or at some other time of their choice, they will present their evidence. So much the better. This is a case to be tried before the conscience, the morality, and constitutional instincts of the American people. It is in that sense I present it to the Senate.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be adopted, as it richly and justly deserves to be.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, and that the time necessary for the calling of the roll not be charged to either side, on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Rhode Island? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, what is the situation on the time allotment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has 5 minutes remaining; the opponents have 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator in charge of the bill had to leave the floor on other business, and he asked me temporarily to handle the bill on the floor. Does the opposition wish to use its 5 minutes?

Mr. JAVITS. I have 5 minutes remaining, but if the motion to table is defeated, that is the only time that I will have left. So I would like to reserve that time.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is an optimist. I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] for the purpose of his making a motion on behalf of the majority leader.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on request of the majority leader and in his behalf I move that the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to lay on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from New York. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senators from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE and Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is absent on official business as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Air Force Academy.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is absent because of death in his family.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 38, as follows:

[No. 65 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Anderson	Hill	Monroney
Bartlett	Holland	Morse
Bayh	Humphrey	Moss
Brewster	Inouye	Muskie
Burdick	Jackson	Pastore
Byrd, Va.	Johnston	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Ribicoff
Church	Kefauver	Robertson
Clark	Kennedy	Russell
Eastland	Lausche	Smathers
Edmondson	Long, La.	Sparkman
Ellender	McCarthy	Stennis
Ervin	McClellan	Talmadge
Gore	McGovern	Thurmond
Gruening	McIntyre	Young, N. Dak.
Hayden	McNamara	

NAYS—38

Aiken	Fong	Pearson
Allott	Hart	Proxmire
Beall	Hickenlooper	Randolph
Boggs	Javits	Saltonstall
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Scott
Case	Keating	Simpson
Cooper	Kuchel	Smith
Cotton	Long, Mo.	Symington
Curtis	Mechem	Tower
Dodd	Miller	Williams, N.J.
Dominick	Morton	Williams, Del.
Douglas	Mundt	Young, Ohio
Engle	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—15

Bennett	Goldwater	McGee
Bible	Hartke	Metcalf
Cannon	Hruska	Neuberger
Dirksen	Magnuson	Prouty
Fulbright	Mansfield	Yarborough

So Mr. CHURCH's motion to lay on the table the amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have had printed an amendment similar in character to the one the Senate has just now tabled. The other amendment pertained to the extension services. Some additional problems exist, both as to whether that amendment is to substantive law and whether it would affect the problem of the increase in postal rates.

In view of the mood of the Senate, as just now expressed in connection with this appropriation bill, I feel that the point I wished to make has been made and has been passed upon by the Senate. Therefore, I shall not press for action now by the Senate on the other amendment, but shall proceed along that line when the occasion next presents itself.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators McGEE, COTTON, DODD, and McINTYRE, I submit the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, in line 5, it is proposed to insert:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Educational television facilities

For grants to assist in construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, as

authorized by part IV of title III of The Communications Act of 1934 (76 Stat. 64), and for related salaries and expenses, to remain available until expended $1,500,000 of which not to exceed $40,000 shall be available for such salaries and expenses during the current fiscal year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, because of a misunderstanding concerning the issuance of the rules and regulations which would apply to the grants to assist in the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, as authorized by a recent amendment to the Communications Act of 1934 (76 Stat. 64), the appropriation of $1,500,000 contained in the supplemental appropriation bill as it passed the House was stricken.

However, it is now clear that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is ready to implement the program immediately. The rules and regulations are complete and will be issued immediately following the appropriation of funds. In fact, the application forms have been prepared and approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The reason why it has not been adopted and published is that the Department felt it more appropriate that it not be implemented prior to action by Congress on the appropriation.

Many prospective applicants already have received or are in the process of receiving Federal Communications Commission authorizations. State and local agencies have reported to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare sufficient non-Federal funds available now to require a total of $11,100,000 in Federal matching grants. In many States non-Federal matching funds which have been raised lapse at the end of the fiscal year. For example, in Ohio it is reported that a total of $202,990 would lapse, in South Carolina a total of $125,000 would lapse, in New Mexico it has been reported that $100,000 would lapse, and in Alabama nearly $150,000 would be lost if funds are not voted for 1963. A similar situation exists in my home State of Minnesota.

Failure to provide these funds in this appropriation bill would prevent some stations from going on the air in time for the beginning of the academic year 1963–64.

A number of other reasons are set forth in a memorandum which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

I urge the Senate to restore the $1,500,000 in the supplemental appropriation as a necessary and important start in implementing the educational television program.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY THE BUDGET ITEM FOR THE EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION FACILITIES ACT SHOULD BE RESTORED BY THE SENATE

I. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is ready to implement the program immediately.

A. Rules and regulations are complete subject to approval of Secretary and will be issued immediately following the appropriation of funds.

B. The application form is prepared. It has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and is ready for publication immediately after funds are appropriated. (It is not proper for a program to be implemented prior to action by Congress on the appropriation.)

C. Preparations have been made so that approximately one half of the proposed program staff can be on duty immediately. This staff will be sufficiently well rounded to provide for processing of applications within 1 week after funds become available.

D. The opening date for acceptance of applications by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will be no later than 2 weeks following final appropriations action. This is to provide time for the applicants to complete the application form.

II. Many prospective applicants are ready to move ahead immediately.

A. Many prospective applicants already have or are in the process of getting necessary Federal Communications Commission authorizations.

1. Nineteen construction permits have been granted and applicants are authorized to go ahead on construction.

2. Nineteen applications for construction permits are now being processed.

3. There are 324 channels currently reserved for educational television and petitions are pending to add 85 additional channel reservations.

B. State and local agencies have reported to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare sufficient non-Federal funds available now, to require a total of $11,100,000 in Federal matching grants.

III. In many States, non-Federal matching funds which have been raised will lapse at the end of the current fiscal year. For example:

(a) In Ohio it is reported that a total of $202,990 would lapse.

(b) In South Carolina a total of $125,000 would lapse.

(c) In New Mexico it has been reported that $100,000 would lapse.

(d) In Alabama nearly $150,000 would be lost.

IV. If funds are not voted for 1963 some stations will not go on the air in time for the beginning of academic year 1963–64. For example in the States mentioned above:

(a) Bowling Green University (Ohio) hopes to activate channel 70 in time for the next academic year.

(b) In South Carolina, channel 29 at Greenville and channel 7 at Charleston hope to be ready for the next academic year.

(c) In Alabama, they hope to have channel 42 at Mobile on the air in time for the school year.

V. Grant funds voted for 1963 can be carried over in 1964. If you cut funds now you slow the whole program down and create a logjam in 1964 because the 1964 budget request (for $7 million) was prepared on the assumption that $2 million would be available from the 1963 supplemental budget request.

(a) Prospective applicants have reported intentions to commence construction on 87 educational television stations before June 30, 1964, provided Federal assistance became available. It has been estimated that an average new station grant will total $175,000. Thus the estimated total need will be far in excess of $15 million in Federal funds.

(b) In addition, 51 established stations have indicated that they are planned for expansion to serve more people over a wider area, to commence work prior to June 30, 1964. The estimated average expansion project is in excess of $100,000. Thus the total need is in excess of $5 million.

(c) Therefore, the request by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for $7 million in 1964 and $2 million in 1963 was very conservative.

For the reasons cited above it is important that funds be provided immediately in order that the educational television facilities program may get underway immediately.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this amendment has been discussed with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Rhode Island, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. The amendment asks the Senate to approve a sum which was recommended; but because of the fact that certain rules and regulations were not ready to be applied by the appropriate agency, the Senate committee did not adopt the $1,500,000 amount. But I understand that those rules and regulations are now ready.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island, who is fully conversant with this matter.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the original supplemental estimate was $2 million. We allowed $1,500,000. But during the markup of the bill before the full committee, question was raised as to whether the rules for the applications had been promulgated. We were informed they had not been promulgated and would not be ready until June 15. Therefore, we voted to delete the entire amount.

However, upon further investigation we found that the rules were completed, but were awaiting the approval of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who in turn was waiting for action to be taken by Congress. It was because of that misunderstanding that he had not approved them. However, he could immediately approve them.

So the rules are complete and action will be taken as indicated in the letter to me dated April 26, 1963, from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. For that reason, we favor the inclusion of this amount.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in view of the facts which have been presented, I have no objection to the action now proposed. But I have very serious objection to such conduct of the business of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, inasmuch as it advised one Member of the House of Representatives that the rules would not be entered until June 15; and, later, when that information came to me, I gave it to the committee, at the time of the markup of the bill. The committee as a whole agreed to have committee staff call the Department in question and ask just what the facts were.

The Department advised committee staff that the facts were as previously reported; namely, that the regulations would not be ready until June 15, or thereafter.

However, as soon as the Senate committee took the action which it was completely justified in taking, under that information, it appeared that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare suddenly discovered that it had not acted or that it did not propose to act as it had previously advised both a Member of the House of Representatives and the Senate Appropriations Committee that it had acted or intended to act.

I am perfectly willing to accede to the proposed restoration of this amount, if it be needed for this salutary purpose and if the facts are as they are reported to be. Of course, I assume that they are. However, I wish the RECORD to show that this Department has acted in this manner, which I think is completely of such nature as not to create confidence on the part of the Senate in the Department's action.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I shall be brief, Mr. President.

First, I wish to confirm fully what the Senator from Florida has said. The action of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in connection with this matter is not such as to give anyone confidence in the Department, although I must say that it is difficult to have confidence in the Department, anyway.

I wish to ask the sponsor of the amendment about it. I understand it will cut the amount requested for salaries from $75,000 to $40,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. That means that 23 positions which have been requested—many of them very high grade positions—will also be cut in proportion, does it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. Down to 50 percent?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I presume the reduction will be in line with that figure.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, with that understanding, I am perfectly willing to support this amendment, because I do not wish to proceed too rapidly with this program. I do not believe that is our responsibility. Furthermore, I see no necessity for the huge Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to handle this whole program now.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, two letters.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., April 26, 1963.

Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PASTORE: We have been informed that a question was raised as to the degree of Department readiness for the administration of the educational television facilities program.

This letter is a report on the status of preparations.

Rules and regulations for the program have been completed and are ready for issuance, subject to the approval of the Secretary, immediately following action on the appropriation.

The application form is prepared. It has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and is ready for issuance immediately following action on the appropriation.

The opening date for acceptance of applications by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will be no later than 2 weeks following final action on the appropriation.

On the basis of information provided this office by potential applicants, it is clear that there is a large group of potential applicants who already have necessary authorizations from the Federal Communications Commission and are ready to proceed with construction immediately.

Sincerely yours,

IVAN A. NESTINGEN,
Under Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., April 26, 1963.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: This is in response to your request regarding the issuance of regulations for the operation of the educational television program.

The regulations are already prepared and can be issued almost immediately, subject to the approval of the Secretary, upon receiving notice of the availability of funds for the operation of the program. Further, application forms have been prepared and approved by the Bureau of the Budget so that applications could be received and processed in the Deparment almost immediately after issuance of regulations.

Sincerely yours,

IVAN A. NESTINGEN,
Under Secretary.

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION AMENDMENT TO SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it would be difficult to overestimate the value to our country of educational television.

Here is a way by which high level educational discussion can be brought before large numbers of Americans, and it can be done at a reasonable cost.

Congress has recognized the potentials of educational television, and a program of matching funds, to help the individual States to activate new educational broadcast stations, was signed into law on May 1, 1962. Unfortunately there have not been any funds appropriated to date to implement this Educational Television Facilities Act.

The 87th Congress adjourned without taking action on the supplemental appropriations bill containing $2 million in the House version and $3 million in the Senate version.

But today we will have a chance to get this program started, if the Senate votes to restore to the pending appropriations bill the $1.5 million for educational television that has already been approved by the House.

Time is important in this instance, and I do not think we should wait until the annual appropriations bill is considered to make funds available for educational television.

At the State and local level, both public agencies and private groups have undertaken extensive plans to establish educational television stations. Money has been raised, through fundraising drives and from appropriations by State legislatures. In some cases the money appropriated by the States will lapse by the end of June unless Federal matching funds are received.

This particular situation is not a problem in Connecticut, but knowledge that the Educational Television Facilities Act is actually in operation would be helpful to the people who are working on educational television in my State.

Connecticut has had an educational television station operating since October 1, 1962. This is station WEDH, channel 24, located in the State capitol, Hartford. The effective range of channel 24 is approximately 30 miles, and coverage is now given to about 40 towns.

Officials of the nonprofit Connecticut Educational Television Corp. tell me that they would like to improve this and extend service to provide cultural and educational programs to more people over a wider area.

Federal matching funds could speed up plans to expand channel 24 facilities, and could also be helpful in setting up other stations in my State so that people in every section of Connecticut will be able to benefit from and enjoy educational television.

The Connecticut State Board of Education has two construction permits at the present time, one for channel 71 in Bridgeport and one for channel 63 in Norwich. The Greenwich Board of Education has an application which is now being processed, for channel 55.

These activities by State and local groups in Connecticut illustrate the extensive work that is now underway throughout the country, to bring closer the day when educational television will be a reality for all of our cities and towns.

And I have been assured that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is ready with the necessary administrative materials. The rules and regulations are complete, subject only to the approval of the Secretary, and will be issued right after the initial appropriation of funds. An application form is prepared, and is ready for publication as soon as funds are available. And HEW expects to be prepared to accept completed applications within 2 weeks after final action on the appropriation.

The pending amendment, which I have joined in sponsoring with Senator HUMPHREY and a number of other Senators, will provide $1.5 million in funds for this program, and I am pleased that the Senate seems willing to adopt it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 27, line 16, it is proposed to strike out

"$550,000" and insert therefor "$615,000", and on page 27, line 18, it is proposed to add immediately before the period "and $65,000 for the United States contribution to the International Peace Corps secretariat".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I am ready to accept the amendment, which provides $65,000 for the International Peace Corps secretariat. It is a good amendment and should be approved by the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator explain the amendment a little further? I have not been able to follow it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The amendment would provide a sum of money as the U.S. contribution to the International Peace Corps secretariat in the amount of $65,000. That sum has been requested by Mr. Shriver of the Peace Corps. It is our contribution to a rather substantial operation of an international nature.

INTERNATIONAL PEACE CORPS SECRETARIAT

The International Peace Corps Secretariat, or Voluntarios de la Paz, Volontaires de la Paix, was provided for by unanimous resolution of the 43 countries attending the International Conference on Human Skills in the Decade of Development at San Juan, P.R., from October 10 to 12, 1962.

The Conference brought together the diverse experience of both the developed and developing countries on a broad range of topics related to the special role of the middle-level worker—the surveyor, teacher, builder, foreman—in the 10 critical years which lie ahead. Against a background of postwar economic theory which laid special stress on technical professionalism and capital investment, the conference explored the new ingredient of skilled manpower.

The concept of volunteers as exemplified in the U.S. Peace Corps and in volunteer organizations of other nations was recognized by the delegates as one of the important ways to unlock an enormous pool of skills and talents for development efforts. At the Conference it became clear that among the citizens of the industrialized nations there are thousands of skilled men and women willing to give a few years of effort to share their skills with others.

On January 1, 1963, the Secretariat began operations. In just 3 months it has become evident that the delegates at Puerto Rico had neither underestimated the need nor the potential of the Secretariat to operate in this field. The Secretariat is already cooperating with six countries which have begun to implement plans for programs similar to the Peace Corps.

Denmark, for example, has publicly announced the formation of a volunteer organization to be used in the developing countries and plans to have between 20 and 30 volunteers in their first project with an ultimate corps of 200.

On February 12, 1963, The Netherlands announced the establishment of a Dutch Peace Corps modeled after the U.S. Peace Corps. The Netherlands program already has an initial appropriation of $555,000 and plans to start the program with a group of 50, with an estimated 200 volunteers when the organization is at full strength.

In West Germany the Bundestag has appropriated approximately $1.4 million for the initial administrative costs of establishing a peace corps. It has been reported that plans are now underway for a formal announcement in the summer of 1963. Germany plans to send from 200 to 500 volunteers into the field this year and anticipates an eventual expansion to 2,000 volunteers.

Norway has also taken steps to establish a peace corps program and plans to have its first 50 volunteers overseas by next fall.

In New Zealand, Volunteer Service Abroad (VSA) has been established, and Sir Edmund Hillary was named its president.

In addition to these programs, Foreign Minister Muniz, of Argentina, announced recently in a meeting at Peace Corps Washington headquarters the establishment of a program which would send from 200 to 300 teachers from Argentina to other Latin American countries. National peace corps programs are also under serious discussion by the Governments of Italy, Switzerland, and Belgium.

If all of these plans are carried forward, the combined results of these programs will be to have in the field, less than a year after the Puerto Rican Conference, more than 500 volunteers with prospects that the number of volunteers from countries other than the United States will reach 2,000 by the end of 1964.

IN-COUNTRY VOLUNTEER GROUPS ORGANIZED

In addition to its work in the industrial nations, the Secretariat is working with those underdeveloped nations which are actively considering the mobilization of their own youth to work in volunteer service organizations within their own countries. The Secretariat is preparing volunteer corps projects in cooperation with the Agency for International Development in El Salvador and Honduras. Discussions are also underway with officials in other countries in Latin America, and plans are developing for similar discussions in Africa.

Both within the industrial nations and the newly developing nations the Secretariat is planning services and assistance along several functional lines:

First. Placement of volunteers: A number of nations have requested the assistance of the Secretariat in a determination of project assignments for their volunteers, and have consulted the Secretariat for project descriptions and placement opportunities. The Secretariat plans to establish a clearinghouse which will correlate requests for volunteers with the supply of various skills arising within the volunteer programs of the industrial nations.

Second. Training of volunteers: Several countries have requested assistance in developing their training programs. Italy has tentatively offered the Secretariat a tract of land in Sicily which could be used by the European countries for a jointly financed and administered training camp.

Third. Selection of volunteers: Several governments have requested assistance from the Secretariat in the important problem of selecting volunteers.

Fourth. Orientation for peace corps. The Secretariat is also planning orientation programs for Peace Corps directors and administrators of new volunteer programs which will offer a full 5-week program of instruction in the various phases of administration. In addition, a 10-day seminar is also being scheduled for Africa which will bring together interested officials from various African governments to discuss the problems of setting up volunteer service groups.

WORK WITH PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS

While activity in the public sector has received the primary attention of the Secretariat, its cooperation with the private sector is no less significant. The Secretariat is assisting private volunteer organizations throughout the world in recruiting, selection, training, and placing their volunteers. Also it has been cooperating with the Business Council on International Understanding, an organization of about 40 leading firms of the United States engaged in oversea activity. Representatives of the Business Council on International Understanding attended the Puerto Rican Conference and agreed to undertake the responsibility of establishing some pilot training programs for nonemployee nationals in several underdeveloped countries.

In addition to these principal activities, the Secretariat maintains a regular and systematic program of distributing information. For example, the final report of the Conference will be printed by Harper & Row in book form.

To implement this program, the small Secretariat staff initially detailed from the U.S. Government will soon be supplemented by full-time delegates from Israel and Germany to be financed by those governments. Along with this, eight governments have detailed members of their Embassies in Washington to serve as participant advisers who meet with the Secretariat to provide counsel and assistance.

THE SECRETARIAT COSTS

For the period of January 1, 1963, to June 30, 1963, it is estimated that the total cost of maintaining the Secretariat would be $150,000. Of this sum, $80,000 is being contributed by the Department of State from its International Conferences and Contingencies appropriation, covering all costs of the Secretariat except personnel services. The remaining $70,000 covers the cost of personnel from the Department of State, the Agency for International Development, and the Peace Corps who are detailed to the Secretariat on a nonreimbursable basis.

It was fitting that the U.S. Peace Corps should play a prime role in the Conference that created the Secretariat. The Peace Corps was conceived on the premise that the middle-level skills are essential to economic development and that these skills can be transferred from one

person to another by example as well as in a formal teaching situation. The Conference thus arose directly out of this basic experience of the Peace Corps in the field.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. This amount was allowed by the House Committee on Appropriations, but was taken out on the floor of the House.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. Shriver took the subject up with me and several other Members of the Senate, and it was decided that the item should be restored to the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield back whatever time is available to the other side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Who yielded back the time against the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was the proponent of the amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. The proponent was the Senator from Minnesota. The Senator in charge of the bill, who naturally would have to be in opposition to the amendment, would yield back the opposition time. If the Senator from Colorado wishes time, I will be glad to yield to him.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator in charge of the bill is not in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, he is in friendly opposition.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am a friendly opponent.

Mr. ALLOTT. The opposition is too friendly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer my amendment No. 71 and ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendment of Mr. DOUGLAS is as follows:

On page 55, line 12, immediately before the words "The Act" it is proposed to insert "SEC. 401." On page 57 at the end of line 4 it is proposed to insert quotation marks. On page 57, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "SEC. 4. This title" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 402. Sections 401 and 402 of this title". On page 57, immediately after line 6 it is proposed to add the following new sections:

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 403. As used in sections 403 through 415, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise—

(1) The term "election" includes a general, special, or primary election, including a preferential primary, and a convention or a caucas of a political party held for the purpose of nominating candidates;

(2) The term "candidate" means an individual whose name is presented at an election for nomination for, or election as, President or Vice President, or Senator or Representative in, or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, whether or not such individual is nominated or elected;

(3) The term "political committee" includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures in an aggregate amount exceeding $2,500 in any calendar year for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence in any manner whatsoever the election of a candidate or candidates or presidential or vice presidential electors;

(4) The term "contribution" includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit, of money, or anything of value, or transfer of funds between committees, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforcible, to make a contribution;

(5) The term "expenditure" includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift, of money, or anything of value, or transfer of funds between committees, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforcible, to make an expenditure;

(6) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons; and

(7) The term "State" includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, any possession of the United States, and the District of Columbia.

CAMPAIGN PRACTICES

Organization of political committees

SEC. 404. (a) Every political committee shall have a chairman and a treasurer. No contribution shall be accepted, and no expenditure made, by or on behalf of a political committee for the purpose of influencing an election until such chairman and treasurer have been chosen. No expenditure shall be made for or on behalf of a political committee without the authorization of its chairman or treasurer.

(b) Every person who receives a contribution for a political committee shall, on demand of the treasurer, and in any event within five days after the receipt of such contribution, render to the treasurer a detailed account thereof, including the name and address of the person making such contribution, and the date on which received. It shall be the duty of the treasurer to see to it that all contributions received by or for a committee shall be kept separate from any personal funds and deposited in a special account.

(c) It shall be the duty of the treasurer of a political committee to keep a detailed and exact account of—

(1) all contributions made to or for such committee;

(2) the name and address of every person making any such contribution, and the date thereof;

(3) all expenditures made by or on behalf of such committee; and

(4) the name and address of every person to whom any such expenditure is made, and the date thereof.

(d) It shall be the duty of the treasurer to obtain and keep a receipted bill, stating the particulars, for every expenditure by or on behalf of a political committee exceeding $100 in amount. The treasurer shall preserve all receipted bills and accounts required to be kept by this section for a period of two years from the date of the filing of the statement containing such items.

Reports by political committees

SEC. 405. (a) The treasurer of a political committee shall file reports of receipts and expenditures with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, on forms to be prescribed by him, and shall transmit a copy of such reports (except as provided in section 410 (b)) to the clerk of the United States district court for the district in which the principal office of the committee is located. Such reports shall be filed, complete as of June 30 and December 31 of each year, and as of the tenth day next preceding the date on which an election is to be held, and as of the thirtieth day following an election, with respect to which contributions were received or expenditures made by such committee. In each instance reports shall be filed not later than the third day following the reporting date as above provided. Each report shall contain—

(1) the amount of cash on hand at the beginning of the reporting period;

(2) the name and address of each person who has made a contribution to or for such committee in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of $100 or more, together with the amount and date of such contribution; and for the purposes of this paragraph the term "contribution", as used herein, shall not include transfers of funds to or from political committees or candidates;

(3) the total sum of individual contributions made to or for such committee during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (2);

(4) the name and address of each political committee or candidate from which the committee received any transfer of funds, together with the amounts and dates of all such transfers;

(5) the total sum of all contributions made to or for such committee during the calendar year;

(6) the name and address of each person to whom an expenditure has been made by such committee in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of $100 or more, and the amount, date, and purpose of such expenditure;

(7) the total sum of all expenditures made by such committee, during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (6);

(8) the name and address of each political committee or candidate to which the committee made any transfer of funds, together with the amounts and dates of all such transfers; and

(9) the total sum of expenditures made by such committee during the calendar year.

(b) The reports required to be filed by subsection (a) shall be cumulative during the calendar year to which they relate, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous report only the amount need be carried forward.

(c) The report required to be filed as of December 31 shall cover the entire calendar year.

(d) In the case of political committees supporting candidates for President, Vice President, or Senator, a copy of the report filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives under subsection (a) shall be filed with the Secretary of the Senate.

(e) The reports required to be filed by subsection (a) of this section shall also contain a list of the names of candidates in whose behalf contributions were received or expenditures made. In the case of political committees supporting more than one candidate (and State and local candidates), the amount of the total expenditures allocable to each candidate—

(1) shall be in the same ratio as expenditures on behalf of each candidate for printing and advertising, radio time, and television time bears to the total of such expenditures, or

(2) where no expenditures were made for Federal candidates for any of such purposes there shall be charged to each Federal candidate an amount equal to the full expenditure

divided by the total number of candidates, Federal and State;

except that expenditures specifically designated for an individual candidate shall be charged to such candidate.

(f) Whenever any report is filed by the treasurer of any political committee pursuant to subsection (a), such treasurer at the same time shall transmit a true and correct copy of such report to each candidate on whose behalf such report reflects any contribution received, or any expenditure made, by such political committee.

Reports by others than political committees

SEC. 406. Every person (other than those filing reports pursuant to section 405) who makes an expenditure in one or more items aggregating $100 or more within a calendar year, other than by contribution to a political committee, for the purpose of influencing, in two or more States, election of candidates, shall file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, on a form to be prescribed by him, an itemized detailed report of such expenditures in the same manner as required of the treasurer of a political committee by section 405, and shall file a copy thereof (subject to the provisions of section 410(b)) with the clerk of the United States district court for the district in which such expenditures are made, and in the case of any expenditure in support of a candidate for President, Vice President, or United States Senator, shall file a copy of the report with the Secretary of the Senate.

Reports by candidates

SEC. 407. (a) Every candidate shall file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, on a form to be prescribed by him, reports of receipts and expenditures and shall transmit a copy thereof to the Secretary of the Senate if a candidate for Senator, and (except as provided in section 410 (b)) to the clerk of the United States district court for the district in which the candidate resides. Such reports shall be complete as of the tenth day next preceding the date on which an election for the office for which he is a candidate is to be held, and as of the fortieth day following such election, and in each instance shall be filed not later than the third day following the reporting date; except that where a candidate in order to qualify for the general election must run in two successive primaries in one party no second report on the first primary will be required for those candidates participating in the second primary if reports filed for the second primary are cumulative and supplementary of the report filed before the first primary. Such reports shall contain a correct and itemized detailed report of contributions received and expenditures made by him in aid or support of his candidacy for election, or for the purpose of influencing the result of the election, in the same manner as required of the treasurer of a political committee by section 405, including amounts expended from his own funds.

(b) The reports required to be filed by subsection (a) shall be cumulative, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous report, only the amount need be carried forward.

Formal requirements on filing reports and statements

SEC. 408. The reports and statements required by this title to be filed by a candidate, a treasurer of a political committee, or by any other person, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the copies thereof required to be filed with the Secretary of the Senate, and (subject to the provisions of section 410(b)) with the clerk of the United States district court—

(1) shall be verified by the oath or affirmation of the person filing such report or statement, taken before any officer authorized to administer oaths;

(2) shall be deemed properly filed when delivered to the specified recipient, or when deposited in an established post office within the prescribed time, duly stamped, registered, and properly addressed, but in the event it is not received, a duplicate of such report or statement shall be promptly filed upon notice of its nonreceipt by the officer with whom it is required to be filed; and

(3) a copy shall be preserved by the person filing it for a period of one year from the date of filing.

Duties of the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate

SEC. 409. It shall be the duty of the Clerk of the House of Representatives and of the Secretary of the Senate—

(1) to preserve the reports and statements filed under this title for a period of six years from the date of receipt;

(2) to make such reports and statements available for public inspection during regular office hours;

(3) to make such reports and statements available for such inspection within twenty-four hours of their receipt by them; and

(4) to permit copying of any such report or statement by hand or by duplicating machine, as requested by any person, at the expense of such person.

Duties of clerks of United States district courts

SEC. 410. (a) It shall be the duty of the clerks of United States district courts—

(1) to receive and maintain in an orderly manner all reports and statements required by this Act to be filed with such clerks;

(2) to maintain such reports and statements for public inspection for a period of six years from the date of receipt;

(3) to make such reports and statements available for public inspection during regular office hours;

(4) to make available for public inspection each report and statement within twenty-four hours of its receipt; and

(5) to permit copying of any such report or statement by hand or by duplicating machine, as requested by any person, at the expense of such person.

(b) In States where the secretary of state or other State official is authorized to perform the duties specified in this section, the filing of reports and statements under the title shall be with such State official in lieu of the filing with the clerk of the United States district court.

General penalties for violations

SEC. 411. (a) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this part shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(b) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this part shall be fined not more than $10,000 and imprisoned not more than two years.

Expenses of election contests

SEC. 412. This Act shall not limit or affect the right of any person to make contributions or expenditures for proper legal expenses in contesting the results of an election.

Effect on State laws

SEC. 413. This Act shall not be construed to annul, or to exempt any candidate from complying with, the laws of any State relating to the nomination or election of candidates, unless such laws are directly inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

Partial invalidity

SEC. 414. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Repealing clause

SEC. 415. All other Acts or parts of Acts inconsistent herewith are repealed.

PART III—AMENDMENTS TO CRIMINAL CODE

Definitions

SEC. 416. Section 591 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 591. Definitions

"When used in sections 597, 599, 602, 608, 609, 610, and 612 of this title—

"(1) The term 'election' includes a general, special, or primary election, including a preferential primary, and a convention or a caucus of a political party held for the purpose of nominating candidates;

"(2) The term 'candidate' means an individual whose name is presented at an election for nomination for, or election as, President or Vice President, or Senator or Representative in, or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, whether or not such individual is nominated or elected;

"(3) The term 'political committee' includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures in an aggregate amount exceeding $2,500 in any calendar year for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence in any manner whatsoever the election of a candidate or candidates or presidential or vice presidential electors;

"(4) The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit, of money, or anything of value, or transfer of funds between committees, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforcible, to make a contribution;

"(5) The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift, of money, or anything of value, or transfer of funds between committees, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforcible, to make an expenditure;

"(6) The term 'person' includes an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons;

"(7) The term 'State' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, any possession of the United States, and the District of Columbia."

Publication or distribution of election materials

SEC. 417. Section 612 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after the word "names" wherever it appears therein the words "and addresses".

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 418. Sections 403–419 shall take effect on January 1, 1964, except that the provisions of this Act shall not apply to contributions and expenditures made prior to such date; but nothing in this Act shall relieve any person from filing any statements or reports required under the law in force prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 419. Sections 403 through 419 of this title may be cited as the "Federal Elections Act of 1963".

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is an amendment to the Fulbright amendment, which was submitted by the Committee on Appropriations. The Fulbright amendment deserves support because it was a proper effort on the part of the eminent Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to strike at the abuses which have been revealed in investigations concerning the passage of the Philippine war claims bill of last year. The eminent Senator from Arkansas, in an effort to prevent Mr. John O'Donnell

from receiving fees, has proposed two vital changes in this act which the Congress passed last year at the recommendation of the administration and with nearly unanimous newspaper approval.

The first is that the amounts of the claims are to be paid by the American Government to the Philippine Government, and the Philippine Government will then settle directly with the claimants, instead of the American Government making its payments to the claimants.

Second, a proviso is attached that none of the money is to be paid as fees to those who have served as attorneys or agents in connection with any such claims.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] deserves all praise for his efforts.

I presume that a point of order could legitimately be made against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriations bill. But I shall not make such a point of order, and I hope that no other Senator will.

It is also possibly true that the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas may ultimately cost the American Government more money because a lump sum of $73 million will be paid to the Philippines and, to the degree that individual claims are unjustified, this will mean that the money in question will, in all probability, go into the Philippine treasury and not be retained in the American Treasury. In the case of people who have died or moved or for one reason or another do not push their claims, the Philippine Government will nevertheless get the money.

Estimates have been made that the loss may amount to several millions of dollars. It may also be quite possible that the amendment will not affect to any great degree the ultimate amounts which Mr. O'Donnell will receive. Despite the language on lines 7 to 11 of page 56, to the extent Mr. O'Donnell has a legal agreement with the private claimants, in all probability he may well recover the amounts. But whatever the technical faults of the amendment may be, the purpose of the amendment is good. The abuse against which the eminent Senator from Arkansas is striking is real. What he is trying to do is to raise to a higher level the financing of campaigns and the passing of legislation by the Senate and House of Representatives. I heartily agree with that purpose. My amendment is designed to assist the Senator from Arkansas in more fully carrying his laudable desires.

There are at least three weaknesses in our present laws governing the declarations of expenses incurred in political campaigns.

The first is the excessively stringent limitation on the total amounts which a candidate may directly expend in the large States. The limit is $25,000. That may be enough in a small State like Vermont, and possibly enough in a State like Arkansas, but in a State of 10 million people, with 5 million voters, which is the case in my State, that would amount to only one-half of 1 cent per voter. In the State of New York I believe it would be approximately a quarter of a cent per voter. These limitations are excessively stringent and, of course, in practice they become a dead letter. The device which is used to get around the $25,000 limitation is, of course, the creation of independent committees with which the candidate is supposed not to have even a speaking acquaintance, but which in all frankness spend most of the money. That device was first used by the Republicans in Wendell Willkie's campaign of 1940 to avoid the $3 million limitation upon expenditures by presidential candidates.

The Republicans and Mr. Willkie created a host of auxiliary and affiliated committees. No one knows how much they spent. But in the aggregate they probably spent enormous sums, in multiples of the $3 million allotted to the candidate himself.

The example set by Mr. Willkie and the Republicans has been copied in most States, and is a common device.

I emphasize that neither the contributions nor the expenditures of these committees have to be reported. Therefore, the declared contributions and expenditures of the candidates themselves bear little resemblance to the actual facts.

The third weakness in the existing publicity provisions is that no declaration is required in the case of primary campaigns. The candidates have to declare for the final election, but they do not have to declare the expenditures incurred or the contributions received in the primaries.

A few years ago, of the 48 States in the Union, at least 20 were one-party States, 12 in the South and 8 in the North. The number of one-party States has diminished since then, as the Democratic Party has increased in strength in New England, Oregon, and the Dakotas, and as the Republicans have increased in strength in certain States of the South. But I think it is safe to say that there are at least 15 States in the country which are one-party States, where the real contest does not take place in the final election but instead in the primary of the dominant party.

There is no national requirement for the declaration of contributions and expenditures during the primaries. It is a well-known fact that many of the candidates in the one-party States have been financed in the primaries by utility companies, large oil interests, and various big business groups; and yet no knowledge of this situation is permitted to penetrate to the general public.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator's amendment seek to strike at fraud which may occur under the existing reporting law? For example, there is no reporting required by committees which accept money on behalf of the candidate in a general election.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. The amendment would provide that committees which receive more than $2,500 must make a full reporting of contributions and expenditures.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Why would the Senator limit it to $2,500?

Mr. DOUGLAS. So the small committees would not be burdened by heavy reporting. If the Senator from Louisiana is dissatisfied and wishes to move a change with respect to those which accept less than $2,500, I shall be glad to accept the amendment, but I hope the Senator will not strain at a gnat and swallow the camel.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I was not seeking to amend the Senator's amendment one way or the other. I heard the debate. The thought occurred that if there were to be a $2,500 exemption a person could have 100 committees and then could proceed to spend a quarter of a million dollars, which would not be reported.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The bookkeeping problem would be very heavy in that case.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Why not have one committee in each county. The average State has nearly 100 counties.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think on the whole this provision which I have suggested, and which the Senate adopted in 1960, is a very good one. What I am seeking to do is to follow in the footsteps of the scholarly Senator from Arkansas and to subject the campaign contributions to pitiless publicity, publicity not merely for the candidate in the general election but also for the candidate in the primary election, and for committees in primaries and in general elections.

This is not a sectional amendment, but it is designed to take away the curtain of secrecy which now operates in this field.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I confess considerable interest in and sympathy with the Senator's proposal. I am wondering if the Senator has introduced it as a bill and had it subjected to the study which the Committee on Rules and Administration would give it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. These features of the bill are taken from another bill introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], along with the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and other Senators as cosponsors. What we have done is to take out certain appropriate sections from that bill. We would not raise the limitation with respect to what a candidate can spend. We would simply provide for publicity on contributions and expenditures in primaries and in general elections by the candidates and by the committees as well. That would be a great influence toward purifying politics in the one-party States such as those south of the Mason and Dixon Line.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the distinguished Senator's interest in the States south of the Mason and Dixon Line. I understand that the State which I represent in part has the strongest, most comprehensive, and detailed law in this field that exists in the Nation.

Aside from that, the purpose of my inquiry was to discover whether the bill which the Senator now offers as an amendment—or the portion of the bill which the Senator now offers as an amendment—has been subjected to study by the Committee on Rules and Administration, and whether there is available a report and recommendation by that committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. These measures have a long history, as the Senator from Florida should be well aware. The general idea was put forward by the late senior Senator from Missouri, Mr. Hennings, in 1952, though at that time primary disclosure was not required.

In January of 1953 Senator Hennings filed a report with the Committee on Rules and Administration, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, recommending that primary elections be subjected to the same regulations as general elections.

In 1955 Senator Hennings included political committees in the bill, as well as candidates.

In 1959, in the 86th Congress, 1st session, a bill covering primaries and political committees was introduced. It also included a tax credit, which my amendment does not.

On July 8, 1959, the Committee on Rules and Administration reported a clean bill, S. 2436. This watered down version did not apply to primaries and the revision of the application of the law to committees was not included.

In January of 1960 the Senate took up S. 2436. Senator Hennings, of Missouri, offered the primary amendment, and it was adopted by a rollcall vote of 50 to 30.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point, on my time?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Was not the Senator from Rhode Island recorded as having voted for it?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I did not try to find the actual yea-and-nay vote. I did not wish to put my colleagues on the spot.

Mr. PASTORE. It is not a matter of being put on the spot. The Senator from Rhode Island, because of the unique position he holds, being in charge of the consideration of this bill, will be forced, of course, to move to table the amendment.

I think the Senator from Illinois understands quite well why that will be done, but I compliment the Senator for bringing this matter up and for pinpointing it again. I am in favor of the proposal. I think it is not being brought up in the proper fashion. For that reason, I shall have to move to table it.

It would be good legislation. I was a party to it before. I cosponsored it. I voted for it. I am sorry that I shall have to move to table it today.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the Senator will not make the motion to table immediately.

Mr. PASTORE. No. I shall do so when the Senator has concluded his remarks.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Florida asked for the history, and I should like to complete it.

The Senate passed S. 2436, with its provisions requiring reporting in the primaries and by committees. The bill was sent to the House. It died in the House and, therefore, did not become a law.

In January of 1961, the present junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] carried on in the tradition of his distinguished predecessor and introduced S. 604, which was similar to the strong version of S. 2436, as passed in the Senate. In May of 1961, hearings were held on S. 604.

The full committee reported a clean bill similar to the watered-down S. 2436, which did not apply to primaries and committees.

In September 1961 the bill was called up on the floor. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] offered primary and committee amendments. Both were defeated. A watered-down bill was offered which died in the House.

In this session, the Senator from Missouri and other Senators have introduced the bill from which these two features are carried over in the present amendment.

This measure which has been before the Senate for almost 10 years, has received extensive consideration in hearings and upon occasion it has been favorably reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration. The situation is therefore ripe for action.

I think we should follow the Senator from Arkansas in the fine steps which he has taken, in connection with publicity on contributions; and this is the way to do it.

I hope no motion to table will be made, and I hope the amendment will receive overwhelming support, particularly from Senators from the one-party States, who thus will have an opportunity to show their devotion to the cause of clean elections.

I look to the future with confidence, despite the cold, freezing blasts of the past.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I say again that I have very great sympathy with the Senator's efforts, but I do not want to leave the record unclear as to one part of his statement. I understood the Senator to say that States south of the Mason-Dixon Line were the ones which needed the legislation most.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Most of them need it. Some one-party States north of the Mason-Dixon Line need it, too, but I apply this measure impartially across the country. It so happens that the one-party States are the ones that need it most. As a matter of impartiality, this measure would apply to committee contributions as well as primary election contributions and would hit the North, the East, and the West as well as the South.

Mr. HOLLAND. I want the record to show that various students of politics whom I have seen quoted on this subject all agree that the election laws of the State of Florida, which I represent in part, are the strongest, and go further, and are the most stringent of those of any of the States; that they apply to primary as well as general elections; and that a candidate for a statewide office, in order to protect himself, must obtain a lawyer and secure an accountant to check the expenditures made, because every single expense to be paid must go on a voucher directed to him. While I am perfectly willing to support the effort of the Senator from Illinois, and again confess considerable sympathy with what he is trying to do, although I do not think this is the way to do it, I do not want the record to be unclear on this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. My State, of which I happen to know most——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I point out that most of my time has been consumed by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PASTORE. For that reason I will yield 10 minutes to the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would like to take 5 minutes, and then yield to the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. HOLLAND. I will finish my remarks in 1 minute.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I assign 1 minute to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for yielding me 1 minute, as well as 10 minutes to the Senator from Illinois. I want the record to be clear that all interest in cleanness in policies is not confined to the State of Illinois, so ably represented by the distinguished Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I never intimated that it was.

I thank the Senator for pointing out the good election laws of the State of Florida, most of which were brought about I believe as a result of the efforts of my friend, Mr. Nelson Poynter, editor and publisher of the St. Petersburg Times; but Florida is unique in the one-party States in its rigid regulations. I hope States like Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, and Arkansas will fall in line on this matter, so that we may be sustained in our efforts.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I did not mention Louisiana, but if the Senator wants me to do so, I shall be glad to include Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is the Senator offering a motion to suspend the rules?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am offering this amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. I think a point of order legitimately could be raised against the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, because it is legislation on an appropriation bill, although it passed muster in the Appropriations Committee, which generally is

very rigid on such matters. If the Fulbright amendment is in order, I submit that my amendment to the Fulbright amendment is in order. I am sure the Senator from Louisiana will not take advantage of parliamentary tactics to throw us out of the ball park.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. For some time I have been trying to persuade the House to consider the veterans' insurance bill. It has passed the Senate on several occasions. If the Senator's amendment is in order, mine should be. I would like to have that amendment adopted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator's amendment would be very helpful, and as he knows I am a cosponsor of his bill and have supported it many times. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] may find he has opened a Pandora's box.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. In that regard, what would be the difference in principle between the Fulbright amendment, with respect to the payment to certain Philippine beneficiaries, and the provision on the next sugar bill that no country shall receive a quota whose agents have made campaign contributions or otherwise paid lobbying fees in this country?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I take some pride in the fact that I have led the fight for years against the subsidy paid to foreign sugar producers. I would be glad to support such an amendment.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator see any difference in principle?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not.

Senators are operating under a limitation of time. I am very glad to yield to the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the principal cosponsor of the bill introduced by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], from which I derived my amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am very grateful for the remarks of the Senator from Illinois.

I applaud the effort of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to deal with the broader problems of campaign contributions while public attention is centered on the lobbying activities surrounding the Philippine war damage claims bill.

Many of us, under the leadership of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and his predecessor, Senator Hennings, have been trying for years to obtain a general revision of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act which would discourage the improper use of funds to influence elections. The present laws on this subject—wholly apart from any question of contributions by lobbyists for foreign interests—are grievously inadequate. Efforts at reform have been thwarted many times by some of those same Members who are now expressing such strong concern about Mr. John O'Donnell's activities. Of course, I understand this concern and will support the corrective legislation initiated by the Foreign Relations Committee. But simply dealing with this one case will not satisfy the urgent demands for a complete overhaul of our election laws.

One of the most compelling demands for reform, which would be covered by the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, is the extension of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act to primary elections. Any effort to revise our elections laws that fails to extend them to primary elections is about as effective as an appendectomy in which only half of the appendix is removed.

The primary election is the only election that counts in almost one-third of our States in which nomination is tantamount to election. Under the present law even runoff primaries in such States are completely outside the purview of the Federal law. This means that contributions by any persons in connection with such campaigns, need not be reported and can be unlimited in amount insofar as the Federal laws is concerned. What is most significant in terms of the present situation, is that this will continue to be the case even if the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is enacted.

There is no question as to the power of the Congress to deal with primaries for Federal offices. The cases on this point are clear, and there is an obvious precedent in the prohibition in the Labor-Management Relations Act against contributions or expenditures by labor unions, corporations, and national banks in connection with "any primary election or political convention or caucus."

What has been lacking is not power, but desire; and I hope that this missing ingredient has been supplied by the sensational revelations of the Foreign Relations Committee. There is no reason whatever for not striking at this problem now and dealing with it in a meaningful and effective manner. We have had many hearings and debates on this subject. I have joined on many occasions in the sponsorship of legislation substantially identical to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Why should we fear to grasp the nettle? Why should we legislate an illusion? If we want to do something about corrupt practices in elections, but refuse to touch primaries, it seems to me we are demonstrating more hypocrisy than zeal for reform. There is a crying need for curbing fraud and undue influence in elections, a need which will not be met unless we support with the same enthusiasm and determination the proposal to deal with primary elections as the proposal to deal with the activities of a foreign lobbyist.

We have an opportunity today to do more than respond to recent newspaper headlines. We should use this opportunity to overcome a gap in the laws which has been with us for years and which we cannot afford to neglect any longer. This is the opportunity which the Senator from Illinois has given us. I commend him for his initiative and hope that his amendment will be approved.

If an effort is made to use the parliamentary device of tabling, I hope that such a move will be defeated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from New York who over the years has vigorously pushed for sound clean-elections legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the letter which the President sent to the Congress yesterday on this subject be printed in the RECORD at this point. I call special attention to the last eight paragraphs of the message in which the President recommends, following the recommendations of his Commission on Campaign Costs, that there be established an effective system of disclosure and publicity in primary and general election campaigns.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD recommendation No. 3, contained in the April 1962 report of the President's Commission on Campaign Costs.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 30, 1963.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A healthy democratic political system rests on the ability of the electorate to know, understand and judge the attitudes, characteristics, opinions and qualifications of candidates for public office. Clearly, political campaigns are essential to a democracy. But the means by which they are financed have troubled thoughtful observers of the political scene for generations, and the concern has been nonpartisan. The question posed by President Theodore Roosevelt about the propriety of public officeholders being obligated, if only morally, to a comparatively few large campaign contributors is equally pertinent today. Our present system of financing political campaigns is deficient in that it does not insure that candidates, or the parties they represent will have sufficient funds to provide adequate exposure to the electorate, and it has not effectively encouraged small contributions from a very large number of individuals.

To insure candidates will have adequate funds, and to reduce dependence on large contributions of those with special interests, the base of financial support for candidates and parties must be broadened. To accomplish this, improvement of public understanding of campaign finance, together with a system of incentives for solicitation and giving, is necessary.

In October 1961 I appointed a distinguished, bipartisan Commission on Campaign Costs to take a fresh look at the problem of financing presidential campaigns. I was gratified by the enthusiastic bipartisan reception accorded the Commission's unanimous report, made to me last April, and I was pleased to transmit to the 87th Congress legislation designed to carry out its important recommendations. I am transmitting with this letter two of the same legislative recommendations for the 88th Congress.

The first proposed bill is based on the Commission's recommendations of a system of tax incentives for political contributions, providing two alternatives to the taxpayer:

(1) A tax credit against Federal income tax for 50 percent of contributions up to a maximum of $10 in credits a year; and

(2) A tax deduction for political contributions for the full amount of the contribution up to a maximum of $500 per tax return per year (the Commission in its report recommended $1,000).

The contributions eligible for tax benefits would include those made to the national committee of a political party and to one political committee designated by the national committee to receive such contributions in each State. The tax incentive program proposed for an experimental period of two presidential elections is designed to give party solicitors an additional tool to help stimulate individuals to contribute money, in non-election as well as election years.

The Commission stated that if the tax incentive measures it recommended do not accomplish their purposes, alternative approaches would have to be examined, and recommended consideration be given to a matching incentive plan, under which contributions in amounts of $10 or less per person raised by designated political committees would be deposited by those committees with the U.S. Treasury, where the money would be matched by a like sum from Government appropriations. The combined total would be used to pay types of expenses authorized by law, payments to be made by Government check directly to the suppliers of campaign goods and services. The total sum to be matched could be limited by statute. Though this latter plan is not now being proposed in legislative form, I urge the Congress to study this approach, which would encourage party efforts in broadening the financial base of presidential campaigns.

Although there is general agreement that it is undesirable and improper for a candidate for public office to spend money on his candidacy without limit or for individuals to contribute unlimited amounts to candidates, the existing unrealistic statutory ceilings have failed to produce any practical limitation. Because they have not been effective and because existing practices violate the spirit, if not the letter of the law, the Commission has proposed repeal of the ceilings and, as a substitute, establishment of an effective system of disclosure and publicity to reveal where money comes from and goes in campaigns. In the Commission's view, full and effective disclosure, both before and after elections, provides the greatest hope for effective controls over excessive contributions and unlimited expenditures.

The proposed bill would require candidates for President and Vice President, presently exempt from reporting requirements, to report contributions and expenditures in nominating and election campaigns. In addition, the test of whether political committees campaigning for candidates for President and Vice President must report would be changed from whether they operate interstate to whether they raise or spend as much as $2,500 in a year. Further, reports would for the first time be required of individuals and families contributing or spending, singly or in combination, $5,000 or more per year in the aggregate, in connection with the nomination or election of one or more candidates for President or Vice President. Reporting requirements would be extended to include both individuals and groups spending $5,000 or more for bipartisan or multipartisan political activities in any year.

To make the reporting effective, all reports should be submitted to a Registry of Election Finance, a central repository having responsibility to receive, examine, tabulate, summarize, publicize, and preserve the reported data. The proposed legislation would place the Registry under the Comptroller General, with a Registrar, appointed by him, and with a bipartisan Board of Advisers providing guidance.

Two other legislative recommendations which I proposed last year, based on the Commission report, and which I fully support have already been the subject of congressional hearings this session. One bill would suspend for the 1964 campaign the equal time requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act for nominees for the offices of President and Vice President; and the other would promote the orderly transfer of Executive power during transitions between administrations.

These proposals based on the constructive report of the Commission on Campaign Costs have received the approval of former Presidents Harry S. Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower, former presidential candidates Thomas E. Dewey, Adlai E. Stevenson, and Richard M. Nixon, and of the chairmen of both major political parties.

Although the Commission limited its attention to the problems of campaign costs for presidential and vice presidential candidates and its recommendations go only to such campaigns, it pointed out that " * * * it is our view that the measures we propose would have a desirable effect on all political fundraising." The Congress may therefore wish to consider the applicability of any of the recommended practices to campaigns other than presidential or vice presidential.

The people of the United States are entitled to know their candidates for public office and to be free of doubts about tacit or explicit obligations having been necessary to secure public office. I believe the attached draft bills will, if enacted, significantly help in achieving these goals. I hope they will receive prompt and favorable consideration.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3—EFFECTIVE DISCLOSURE AND ABOLITION OF LIMITS ON CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES

The present statutory ceiling of $3 million on the annual receipts and expenditures of an interstate political committee, and the limit on annual individual contributions of $5,000 per person per committee, in no way limit expenditures or contributions. We recommend that they be repealed.

These purported ceilings on committee receipts and expenditures as well as on individual contributions have, if anything, simply stimulated an increase in the number of committees.

The imposition of "realistic ceilings" or "segmental limitations," the latter designed to limit expenditures for certain purposes, e.g., broadcasting, which has been urged by some, would only create a false impression of limitation. Moreover, there is doubt whether individuals could be prohibited from making certain expenditures, instead of contributions if the latter were effectively limited, in view of constitutional guarantees of freedom of expression.

We see no sure way by statute to restrict the amount of money individuals may put into campaigns. Even if there were a way, and if the limitation were fixed at a nominal sum as has been urged upon us, we doubt that the parties could in the near future organize themselves to collect enough money in truly small amounts to meet necessary campaign costs. Limitation must be accomplished, if at all, by other means.

The dependence of candidates on large contributions can best be dealt with by encouraging a growth in small gifts and by an improved system of disclosure.

Under present statutory provisions, there has been inadequate reporting of campaign receipts and expenditures. This has presented to the public an incomplete and distorted picture of presidential and vice presidential campaign finance. The candidates themselves are not required to report at all, and only committees operating in more than one State in the general election must report.

Full and effective disclosure is the best way to control excessive contributions, on the one hand, and unlimited expenditures, on the other. Publicity has a cleansing and policing power far more powerful than that of limitations.

We have been asked to recommend improved ways of financing expenditures required by nominees for President and Vice President. Nonetheless, the financing of campaigns to obtain nomination to those offices is so significant in influencing attitudes toward campaign finance in the general election, and the climate in which solicitation occurs, that we have extended our proposals in this instance to campaigns for nomination as well as election.

We recommend—

That all political committees, interstate and intrastate, State and local, party and nonparty, subsidiary and independent, campaigning directly or indirectly for candidates for nomination or election to the offices of President and Vice President, and raising or spending as much as $2,500 in a year, any part of which aided a candidate for those offices, be required to file campaign finance statements on a regular basis, including reports to be made at a specified time shortly before elections;

That reports should show the totals of receipts (including loans) and disbursements, and should itemize contributions that aggregate $250 or over from one source (including purchases of tickets to dinners or other fundraising events), expenditures of $100 or over, all transfers of funds to or from any candidate or group, and all debts;

That candidates for President and Vice President be required to make similar reports of contributions made to them and expenditures made by them in campaigns for nomination and election, both before and after elections;

That delegates and candidates for delegate to the presidential nominating conventions be required to make similar reports;

That any individual or family (husband, wife, and dependent children) contributing to the above committees as much as $5,000 in the aggregate in a single year, or spending or contributing a combined total of as much as $5,000 per year on behalf of one or more candidates for President and Vice President, for either nomination or election, be required to submit a report of these disbursements;

That individuals and groups taking part or spending money in bipartisan political activities advocated in recommendation No. 1 be required to report any direct or indirect expenditures by them for these purposes that total $5,000 or more in a year.

To assure effective publicity for the information submitted in these reports, we recommend that a central Federal repository, with a nonpartisan or bipartisan advisory board, be established, to be called the Registry of Election Finance. We recommend that the Registry be given responsibility to receive, examine, tabulate, summarize, publish, and preserve the reported data; to prescribe the form in which reports are to be made; to fix the dates of their submission (within latitudes fixed by statute); and to determine how best the data in the reports can be disseminated both before and after elections. We recommend, too, that the Registry have the explicit duty to refer apparent infractions of law to the appropriate law enforcement authorities.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President——

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator from Illinois have sufficient time to yield to the Senator from Missouri? If not, I shall be glad to yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought I had an informal understanding with the majority leader that he yield sufficient time on the bill so that this subject may be fully discussed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. Is there a limitation on the time in which to debate the bill itself?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time limitation on the bill itself.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is to be commended for offering this proposal to improve our Federal election law as an amendment to the pending bill. The first bill I introduced on coming to the Senate was a bill to amend the Federal election laws. The present amendment is a part of that bill. However, efforts to bring the nominating process and intrastate political committees within the purview of Federal election laws go back more than a decade.

My predecessor, the late Senator Tom Hennings, worked many years for this needed improvement in the law. His efforts came to a climax in January of 1960 when the Senate approved a clean-elections bill after adopting by large bipartisan majorities amendments offered by Tom Hennings to extend the law to primaries and to require intrastate political committees to comply with Federal reporting requirements. Final congressional action was not forthcoming so in the early days of the 87th Congress, I introduced a bill similar to the one approved by the Senate the year before.

Near the close of the first session, an elections bill was reported by the Senate Rules Committee. This bill was similar to the bill reported by the Rules Committee in the 86th Congress. It did not provide for extending the law to primaries or intrastate committees. When the bill was brought before the Senate, the junior Senator from New York and I joined in offering amendments to correct this inadequacy. However, we were unsuccessful, and these needed changes were not in the bill approved by the Senate. So the provisions of the pending amendment are not new to the Senate. They have been discussed and debated at length in the Senate. They have met with success and failure.

However, I believe this is a most appropriate time to consider this matter again. The recent disclosure of contributions by Mr. John O'Donnell to several Members of Congress points out clearly the need for strengthening the reporting requirements of our present election laws. When campaign contributions come to light under circumstances such as involved in this situation, there is apt to be an air of suspicion aroused in the minds of many people. However, if our election laws were such as to require the reporting of all contributions, then the chances would be lessened that anyone would jump to any false conclusions.

Full and complete disclosure of campaign finances could not help but improve our democratic elective process. It would help the candidate by removing any air of suspicion, and it would help the American voter by providing him with information essential to a sound decision at the polls.

The nominating process is an integral part of our election system. In some States, it is in fact determinative of who is elected. Therefore, the American voter is entitled to know the facts concerning the financing of primary campaigns as well as general election campaigns.

As to intrastate committees, I believe everyone will agree that the great bulk of campaign financing in the election of Members of Congress is handled by such political committees. To exempt these committees from the reporting requirements of Federal law makes these requirements in reality a sham.

In 1961, the President appointed a Commission to study the financing of presidential campaigns. This Commission under the able leadership of Dean Alexander Heard, of North Carolina, considered the problem most carefully and on April 18, 1962, made a number of recommendations for changes in the law. Based on the Commission's report, the President sent letters to the 87th Congress recommending the enactment of legislation.

Yesterday, the Senate again received a letter from the President recommending certain election legislation, which the Senator from Illinois has placed in the RECORD. One of the proposals recommended by the President is a public reporting bill. While the bill applies only to presidential campaigns, it is appropriate to our discussion today. The bill would require the filing of reports on campaign financing with respect to the nominating process. Also, it would require the filing of reports by intrastate political committees if they receive or expend more than $2,500.

This additional recognition of the importance of full disclosure is significant and I hope the Senate will respond by adopting the pending proposal.

Mr. President, the present law as a practical matter could be considered worse than no law. It fails completely to reach the vast bulk of campaign financing. Yet, abstractly, we do have a reporting law. Thus, many people may be misled into believing that campaign finances are regulated. On the other hand, Members of Congress who have complied completely with the law are sometimes accused of violating the law by failing to report a contribution made either in the primary or to an intrastate committee supporting their candidacy.

The situation can only be cleared up and corrected by the enactment of legislation to strengthen the Corrupt Practices Act—legislation which, in fact, will bring about full disclosure of campaign financing. Then, and only then, will the American voter be in a position to reach a sound decision. Then, and only then, can suspicion with respect to money in politics be eliminated. The approval of the pending amendment would make a substantial contribution to the strengthening of our democracy.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, earlier today an amendment was offered with respect to day care services. I am very appreciative of the fact that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] and the distingished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] took care of the legislative history on that subject, which concerned me very much.

I was opposed to the amendment, as was stated. I should like to have appear in the RECORD the reason for my nonappearance in the Chamber earlier today. I was engaged at a hearing of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations. That is the reason I could not be present at that time. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement dealing with the subject of grants to States for day care services.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALLOTT ON GRANTS TO STATES FOR DAY CARE SERVICES

The public welfare amendments of 1962 added an authorization for grants to States for the development and operation of day care centers, authorizing an appropriation of $5 million for fiscal year 1963, $10 million for 1964, $15 million for 1965, and so forth.

The Bureau of Family Services has not at this time issued regulations governing the program. Instructions have gone to the field on the use of funds when they become available and so forth, but the requisite regulations are not issued at this time.

The State plan must require the appointment of advisory committees to advise the State public welfare agency on the general policy involved in the provision of day care services under the State plan. There is no evidence that the advisory committees in all jurisdictions have been appointed and are functioning. It is presumed that funds would be required to pay per diem expenses of such meetings, funds which have not been appropriated.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, what the Senator from Illinois is doing is in line with the desires of all of us. We recognize that there is much to be desired in the present state of the law on this subject. I should like to point out that I have not had an opportunity to analyze the amendment as thoroughly as I would wish.

I notice that the President of the United States has sent his recommendations with respect to a bill dealing with this very subject. In the brief time that I have had a chance to examine the message, I notice that there are some differences between the bill the President proposes and the bill the Senator from Illinois proposes as an amendment to the pending bill. One difference is in the area of what is raised by others than political committees. Under the Douglas amendment, any amount of $100 or more must be reported. Under the proposal of the President of the United States, only amounts aggregating $5,000 or more must be reported.

I do not know why there is such a big difference, but I believe that the President and his advisers have had an opportunity to study this subject very carefully, and there must be a very good reason for drawing the line at $5,000, instead of $100, as the Senator from Illinois has done.

It seems to me that the pending measure is a rather poor vehicle to which to attach an amendment such as this. I recognize that the Senate is not limited by the rule of germaneness; nevertheless, I believe that a little later in the session, when Senators shall have had an opportunity to digest the recommendations of the President as well as the proposal of the Senator from Illinois, the Senate might be in a little better position to

decide upon a more suitable vehicle to which to attach this amendment, assuming that the Committee on Rules and Administration does not see fit to report the type of bill which we wish. So I suggest to the Senator from Illinois that he delay a little longer the offering of his proposal.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we have waited 10 years. Let us act.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I have 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. President, I find no fault with the intent, spirit, and substance of the amendment; but I do find fault with the timing of its presentation. I believe that it would only confuse the supplemental appropriation bill and would confuse the resolution which was adopted by the Committee on Foreign Relations. For that reason, I move to table the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island to lay on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 69 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Beginning with line 5, page 8, it is proposed to strike out all to and including line 9, page 8.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, this is a very important amendment. If adopted, it would save the taxpayers $30 million. On the amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I shall later renew my request for the yeas and nays.

The supplemental appropriation bill now before the Senate contains a provision, inserted by the Senate committee, for $30 million for civil defense purposes. In its wisdom the other body rejected this item in its entirety, as it should be rejected. However, in the Senate committee report, on page 10, under items for the Department of Defense, there is provision for the expenditure of $30 million for continuing fallout shelter surveys, and for marking, and stocking them. I was shocked to learn that the Senate committee failed to follow the leadership of the other body, which refused to appropriate 1 cent for this purpose.

In England, there are no fallout shelters whatever. In the Soviet Union, there are no civil defense fallout shelters, no holes in the ground, where people can wait for the conquering paratroopers to come, as some of the political has-beens who are occupying paid civil defense positions would have us do in this country. To the contrary, in the Soviet Union the people are being given first-aid instructions and instructions in street fighting from house to house and cellar to cellar.

In the past few months we have heard much talk in favor of economy in Government. Here is an opportunity for Senators to be counted in favor of economy by supporting this amendment, thereby preventing the utter waste of $30 million.

In the original supplemental appropriation bill, a request for almost $62 million was made for this project. This amount was entirely denied by the other body.

Much is said about cutting or pruning Federal expenditures. Here is one place where the taxpayers' money can be saved without in any way curtailing necessary governmental services or jeopardizing the national security. To me, it is unconscionable to wield the meat ax on such budget requests as those for research in communicable diseases and the activities of the Public Health Service, to cite two examples, and then squander $30 million on a completely ineffective civil defense boondoggle.

Some of the so-called civil defense shelters are located in the Federal building downtown in my home city of Cleveland, where a number of men and women are employed. If there should be a sudden nuclear attack, any man worth his salt would not rush to a shelter in the office building where he was employed. He would immediately seek out his wife and children in the outlying portions of the city. He would try to get his family together, perhaps to pray in that moment of terror.

It is foolish to consider appropriating $30 million for fallout shelters, because a nuclear attack could be made upon Washington or any other city of our country by Soviet submarines off our shores, submarines which can fire atomic missiles without giving us any warning whatever. At most, there might be a 15-minute warning of the firing from the Soviet Union of an intercontinental missile with an atomic warhead.

The Cuban crisis proved that our best, and probably only, civil defense in the nuclear age is a firm, determined, resolute stand against aggression, plus the nuclear power to back it up. Last October our President's firm, and unyielding policy in dealing with Khrushchev and Castro's Cuba resulted in our greatest cold war victory. This was because of our nuclear power to support the President's unyielding position.

It would be far wiser to appropriate additional funds for missile programs, jet aircraft, and missile-bearing Polaris submarines than for civil defense schemes which are hopeless at their inception.

Nevertheless, the civil defense planners continue to mesmerize the American public with the illusion that we have an effective civil defense program. Although Congress appropriated $208 million in 1961 and an additional $38 million in 1962 for marking and provisioning fallout shelters, when the crisis came most of them could not be found, were not marked, or were unusable. Only a handful were provisioned. Rations and medical kits on which millions of dollars had been spent were still stocked in Federal warehouses and arsenals. Warning systems were inadequate and virtually useless. This is probably not too important, because in the event of an attack with nuclear warheads there would be, at most, perhaps 10 minutes warning before intercontinental ballistic missiles fell on American cities.

President Kennedy's image had hardly faded from the television screen last October 22nd when the clamor began for more Government spending for fallout shelters. Sharp salesmen were trying to peddle terror, in order to sell more of these utterly useless shelters. It follows, as the night the day, that any new crisis will renew the agitation for holes in the ground to hide in—mainly under a bundle of taxpayers' money. I am trying very hard to save that money.

The Committee of State Governors, meeting in Washington, urged revival of the $600 million fallout shelter program which the Congress had rejected a month before. In my opinion, we acted wisely in doing so.

Of course, if the Governors could persuade Congress to appropriate huge sums of the taxpayers' money, in order to build some fallout shelters and to employ more civil defense officials in their cities, that would add to the political payroll in their States.

What might have happened to that huge sum is indicated by a report of the General Accounting Office, released about the time the Governors were meeting. The report revealed that the Federal Government had distributed $182 million in surplus property to local civil defense units. More than half of this was converted to private use, wasted, or used in the normal operations of local governments to which it had been assigned only for emergency use. That money went down the same drain through which over a billion dollars of the taxpayers' money has been squandered on futile and foolish civil defense projects from 1950 to this good hour.

In the midst of the Cuban crisis, the planners doubled the number of potential shelter spaces, so-called, overnight. By simply using a mimeograph machine, they lowered the suitable safety factor from 100 to 40—meaning that one would supposedly be 40 times safer inside such a shelter than out. Of course, it is highly problematical whether in a nuclear attack lives would be saved, even if a person were 100 times safer in one of these spaces than out of it.

At any rate, signs were hurriedly put up to indicate the shelter areas. Most of the signs were erected after the crisis had subsided. I suppose the main purpose of these shelter signs was to soothe the anxiety of any worried citizen, inasmuch as they certainly would serve no other worthwhile purpose.

All there is to show for the expenditure of hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars are black and yellow shelter signs plastered on every building within sight. Now we are asked to throw away an additional $30 million, in order to continue the myth that there is an effective civil defense program.

Mr. President, last year and in every previous year since I have been a Member of this body, I spoke out against these appropriations. I will continue to speak out against this utterly worthless boondoggle.

In February 1959 I was alone in this fight against the civil defense boondoggle. But since then, many other Members of Congress have come to take the same view that I take—namely, that this program is an utterly foolish waste of public funds. We should stop it. Today we again have an opportunity to begin doing so.

I shall ask for a yea-and-nay vote on this question, because I want Senators who have been talking about economy to have an opportunity to vote on this very worthwhile amendment.

Those who favor a massive fallout shelter building program have estimated that it would cost anywhere from $20 to $200 billion. Even then, there is no guarantee that it will be effective. With extensive advances being made in rockets and nuclear technology, such a fallout shelter program would probably be obsolete before being completed. Unless we are prepared to embark on such a vast gamble and to spend perhaps $200 billion of the taxpayers' money, we should carefully consider the wisdom of piecemeal appropriations amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars, with no really effective purpose.

Mr. President, this amendment gives the Senate an opportunity to make an effective saving of the taxpayers' money. I am not standing alone in regard to this matter. I agree with Gen. Curtis LeMay, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, who, in commenting some months ago on fallout shelters, said:

> I don't think that I would put that much money into holes in the ground to crawl into. I would rather spend more of it on offensive weapons, in the first place.

Maj. Gen. John Medaris, now retired, one of the outstanding authorities on missilery, and former chief of the Army Ordnance missile command, gave his view of this matter.

Senators will recall that only during the Eisenhower administration a few years ago, the now discredited theory of mass evacuation of our cities in event of nuclear attack was also being foolishly pushed by civil defense officials.

General Medaris said:

> The concept of mass evacuation of high density population centers and the burial of our citizenry in deep shelters would negate any kind of positive reaction to attack. It would convert our people into a horde of rabbits scurrying for warrens where they would cower helplessly while waiting the coming of a conqueror.

Mr. President, it would be a great mistake for the Senate to add to the bill, as passed by the House of Representatives, $30 million for furthering the civil-defense shelter program. This is a defeatist psychology. My amendment provides an opportunity to strike out that item, and to manifest to all the world our confidence in the fact that at the present time the United States is the most powerful nation which ever existed under the bending sky of God. Our strength lies in our very great nuclear capacity, not in holes in the ground or shelter signs on public buildings.

Mr. President, the taxpayers have a right to know the truth about civil defense. They are tired of high-salaried officials who think up schemes that will not be of any use in event of nuclear war.

Incidentally, I note that in the budget for the fiscal year 1964 the average salary for paid civil defense employees will be $9,520 a year, one of the highest in the entire Federal bureaucracy. By comparison, employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation will average $8,383; there will be an average salary of $9,122 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and there will be an average salary of $7,589 for the Small Business Administration—to name a few of the many important Government agencies where the average salary is less than that for civil defense employees.

It would be difficult to find another agency in the Federal Government in which so many have done so little to earn so much.

Mr. President, before we appropriate additional millions of dollars of taxpayers' money to continue this boundless boondoggle, I urge that we take a good hard look at what all these expenditures will accomplish. I also urge that the administration review its entire civil defense policy. I am certainly one Member of this body who desires at all times to support the administration when I can in good conscience do so. I am proud of the present administration. I am proud of the record being made by President Kennedy. I am proud of his firm, determined and resolute policy which compelled Khrushchev to turn tail and withdraw his offensive missiles and airplanes from Castro's Cuba.

However, I feel that administration officials should review this civil defense policy so that we in the Congress may be aware of the ultimate cost of this program, so we know where we are going in this area. Until that is done, I for one, do not intend to vote for further funds for useless shelters. I shall continue to oppose such squandering of the taxpayers' money to the utmost of my ability and energy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, due to the fact that a commitment was made yesterday to the Senator from Ohio, and in order to honor that commitment, I am about to make an unusual request, with which I hope the Senate on this occasion will concur. I ask unanimous consent for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that will not be a precedent. The situation is unusual. It will not be used again except under unusual circumstances.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, has the Senator from Ohio concluded?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Yes. I yield the floor.

Mr. PASTORE. It has often been said—and I believe it bears repeating—that we are living in times of utmost peril and peculiar paradox. Only this week I attended one of the hearings of the Appropriations Committee on Defense. The budget request for the fiscal year 1964 is more than $52 billion. The $52 billion will be spent in fiscal 1964 to do what? To make the very things that we pray to God will never be used.

Our appropriations for atomic energy are $2.5 billion. Where do we find the paradox? We would spend $52 billion to build a bomb, and yet we would not allot one penny to protect our women and children against the fallout if a bomb were used.

Today the Senator from Ohio tells the Senate that Americans will be scurrying like rats running down into cellars and holes in case a bomb is dropped. The Senator from Rhode Island is willing to concede that if a bomb—God forbid—were to fall on the Capitol today, there is no place that we could go to hide. What if that bomb were in the megaton range? If we could go anywhere—God forbid—there would be nothing to come up to.

But if for one moment we could overcome a total surprise attack—and I pray to God that it never comes—there would be an opportunity if our population has a place of refuge to go. We need not spend $20 billion to give our people that opportunity. We could make it available with the modest program that is before the Senate today.

The program is not a starry-eyed imaginary one. The program does not contain 5 cents for the construction of a shelter. But what have we done? We have had our Defense Department comb the entire Nation. They have gone to every private building owner, the municipalities, and the States, and they have found areas now existing to which people could go.

If a bomb should fall, let us say, on New York and the wind were southward, with the contamination coming towards Washington, a man might not have a chance to leave the Capitol and gather his children and take them home. If he did take them home, where would he put them when he got them home? Down in the cellar.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for two questions?

Mr. PASTORE. I shall yield for 15 questions.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. If a nuclear warhead were to fall on New York or Washington, it would probably come from a submarine without any warning whatever, would it not?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not care where it might come from. I am concerned with where it might fall. How about the people in Baltimore or elsewhere?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. If it came without any warning, what good would the $7 million of biscuits we have already bought from large bakery concerns for stocking the shelters be? I assert that is an utter waste of the taxpayers' money. What good would those biscuits be to anyone?

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator asks me that question, I shall be glad to answer.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Then I ask the Senator the question, and also the following question.

Mr. PASTORE. Let me answer the first one.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. My second question is as follows: Does not the Senator from Rhode Island know that there are no shelters whatsoever in England?

Mr. PASTORE. We in America—responsible for America are trying to provide them here in America. That is what the program is all about. We have Mr. McNamara's letter assuring us that the program is in the national interest.

The Senator from Ohio is saying, "Let us roll over and die. Let us do nothing, he suggests because the bomb which the Soviets have is so terrible there is nothing we can do about it."

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The Senator from Ohio repudiates that statement.

Mr. PASTORE. He may, but that is what he implied.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. That is not the attitude of the Senator from Ohio at all. The attitude of the Senator from Ohio is that digging a hole in the ground for a shelter for a man employed in a Federal building so that he might run down in that shelter in a moment of peril, and not go to his wife and children, is not the answer. If he should be saved, he would be the wrong kind of man to be saved.

Mr. PASTORE. I would expect that his wife and children would also have a shelter to which they could go. If the air were contaminated, the worst place for that man or his loved ones to be would be in the streets. One should be underground as soon as possible—in a refuge close by.

The authorities to whom I have referred have combed the United States of America to find places underground.

What would we do with the $61 million? We talk about a boondoggle. We talk about economy. Economy has nothing to do with it. The program is a matter of life and death.

The question is: Will America awaken and realize that there exists a bomb which can destroy the world? How do we protect ourselves against that bomb? That is the question before the Senate today. It is not a question of boondoggling.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Does the Senator deny the statements of General LeMay and General Medaris?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not care who said what. But does the Senator from Ohio deny the statement of Secretary of Defense McNamara?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The Senator from Ohio states that a submarine has the capability of striking us, without any warning whatever.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator from Ohio saying that when the Russians get ready to take that action—and I hope and pray they never do—the destruction will be so total no one in America could be saved?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. No, indeed. The Senator from Ohio is saying that our power of instant retaliation—our missilery, and Air Force—cannot be destroyed in one strike or in two strikes, and the Senator from Rhode Island knows that. That is our best defense.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Rhode Island has been connected with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy since 1953. With all due deference to every other Senator, when it comes to atomic energy, I have devoted more hours to the study of fallout and the damage that can be wrought by a nuclear war than has any other Senator. I do not make that statement as a boast. I state it as a responsibility. The program is not new to me. I never could propose a program involving the expenditure of $20 billion if it were unrealistic. But we have presented a reasonable program. We do not propose to build shelters. We will use what we have. The Senator has talked about dog biscuits. We are not putting dog biscuits or any other kind of biscuits down in the shelters.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Seven million dollars' worth has been purchased from the Kroger Co., as the Senator should know.

Mr. PASTORE. We are putting in them clean water that will not be contaminated. There will be lavatories that can be used. We are putting in things that will save American lives. That is what we would provide in the program. The House eliminated the item. I know that.

The House has always eliminated it. I know that. But the Senator from Rhode Island, who has a responsibility in respect to atomic energy, could not sleep tonight if he were a party to eliminating it all. I could not look my children straight in the face if I voted to knock it all out.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The Senator from Ohio has the same responsibility.

Mr. PASTORE. I know that. I have a responsibility to see to it that the Senator from Ohio does not do that. That is my responsibility.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The Senator from Ohio may not prevail.

Mr. PASTORE. That is what I urge the Senate this afternoon. This is a good program. This is a sound program. This is a modest program. This is a program for the American people and for their safety in this very dangerous world.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The Senator from Ohio thinks that $30 million is a great deal of money.

Mr. PASTORE. The day when we can bury all of the bombs at the bottom of the sea, where they belong, is the day that the Senator from Rhode Island will stop worrying about civil defense. Until that day comes, I shall not be persuaded or dissuaded by cliches about boondoggling, or by high-sounding phrases like, "if you want economy, begin it here—begin it with civil defense."

Do not begin it here. Do not begin it with civil defense. It could spell utter disaster for the American people. There is a chance to survive. Let us choose that chance.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to my friend.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. May I ask the distinguished Senator, who has served on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for a number of years, if this is not correct: Assuming that the Soviet Union and no other power used atomic weapons on the mainland of the United States, is it not correct to say that we have a great deal of nuclear power and more than we need to defeat them if we decided to use such weapons?

Mr. PASTORE. I have often said, and I repeat today, that there are enough bombs in the stockpiles of the world—that means in the stockpiles of the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain and possibly France—so that if every bomb were strategically dropped man could destroy everything man has built from the time of beginning. That is how extreme the peril is.

But we are making a little progress. We ask for a litttle bit of an approach—to do what? It is to recommend to people that there are places to which they can go. It will say that we have found enough spaces in America to protect 100 million people. That is what we are trying to do.

If a person goes to one of those places, and his child says, "May I have a drink of water," there will be clean water. If his child says, "I am hungry. Will you give me a biscuit?" there might be a biscuit available. What is wrong with that?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. What is wrong with it is the advance of science. What might be effective today will be of no effect a year from now.

Mr. PASTORE. That may be so. Today we live. Tomorrow a new generation will provide for that problem. We must meet the situation as it is. I am not ready to quit because technology has not reached its pinnacle.

I do know—and I say this with all the sincerity at my disposal—that there is a chance; all we are talking about is giving America that chance.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The Senator from Ohio is not talking about quitting. The Senator from Ohio voted for every appropriation for the defense of our country. We have tremendous nuclear power.

Mr. PASTORE. I never said that the Senator from Ohio was a quitter.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. We could annihilate the Soviet Union.

Mr. PASTORE. I never said that. I said that the Senator is untimely in becoming an economizer with civil defense, at the wrong time and in the wrong place.

"Not here," I say to my friend, "Mr. YOUNG, not here."

This is the great chance we have. Let us give it to America.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As one who once served on the Committee on Armed

Services and who presently serves on the Committee on Foreign Relations, it seems to this Senator that the most neglected phase of our entire defense program has been civil defense. We have always known, ever since the first day the Soviet Union had atomic weapons, that it was within their capability to get through with some of the weapons, and we know that today.

I would assume, if we were in a large city and a multimegaton bomb hit that city, the bomb would destroy everything immediately surrounding it, but for those who were not in the immediate area of the blast there would be some possibility of survival.

Mr. PASTORE. There would be a chance for them.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Provided there was a place for them to go.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. What is the matter with that, if Congress is spending billions of dollars to overkill, to provide a capacity to kill everybody in the Soviet Union three times?

Mr. PASTORE. And not one dime for protection.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is what I cannot understand.

Mr. PASTORE. That is what is involved. I cannot understand it either.

Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

From an outside source, I happen to have heard recently of the Senator's great assistance in working upon atomic energy and nuclear power problems. The Senator has been working with intelligence and capability and a great deal of persistence. I commend him.

The appropriation recommended is $30 million. The House struck out this item. The House was asked to provide more than $60 million, but struck out the whole thing. We would provide $30 million.

What would that do? At the present time there are a number of shelters in existing buildings. Those would be sufficient for approximately 70 million spaces.

This money would provide the biscuits and the water for the stocking of the existing shelters, up to approximately 70 million spaces if all the money were used. We would not install the full number at the present time, but would put in enough money to carry the program through the fiscal year.

There are existing contracts with biscuit companies and other providers. If we do not provide at least some of the $30 million, those contracts will stop. It would cost much more money to bring them back into existence, after the contracts were stopped and the companies had gone on to other business.

As the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Rhode Island have said, we face two kinds of problems. There is the problem of protecting from blast after a nuclear bomb is burst, and there is another problem in protecting from radioactive fallout. We would help people who may be subject to radioactive fallout. To protect them from the actual blast would cost many billions of dollars.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me 2 or 3 more minutes?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield the 3 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts may proceed for 3 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as I have said, there are two great problems. There is the problem of protecting from blast, and there is the problem of protecting from radioactive fallout. It would cost many billions of dollars to protect from blast.

What would we do? We would provide this program, and also put large amounts of money into counteroffensive weapons, to make it impossible for the Soviet Union or any other country to deliver bombs against our country, because we would counterstrike. That is one way of protecting from blast.

What we seek to do by this program is to protect people from radioactive fallout. The shelters, it is believed, would be the best protection. They might be shelters in existing buildings. They might be shelters in private buildings, or in Federal buildings, or possibly in new buildings yet to be constructed.

This money would provide for the stocking of shelters we know are in existence today.

That is all the $30 million would do. After the first of next year we can reexamine the whole program. There is $300 million in the budget for the next fiscal year. Whether we want to appropriate all of that is a question. This money would provide for the stocking of the shelters we know to be in existence and for the continuation of contracts through June 30 of this year with the companies which are already providing the biscuits and the clean water.

I hope this proposal will be agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield, if I have any time remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Is it not a fact that many millions of dollars have already been spent for stocking the shelters?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. One hundred and eleven million dollars has already been spent.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Much of that has been spent for stocking shelters.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. If we buy more biscuits and stock more shelters, the only good which will come from that will be that we shall put money into circulation, by giving it to the bakeries.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Oh, no. I have a fine friendship with the Senator from Ohio, and I respect him; but I could not imagine a statement that made less sense.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Does the Senator think that marking shelters in apartment houses makes sense?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The shelters have all been approved by the Federal Government as possible shelters, if stocked; and they are in existing buildings.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. They have been surveyed, but some of them have not been marked or stocked.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. They have been surveyed. This language would provide for 70 million places in such shelters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mrs. NEUBERGER (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "nay."

On the vote, the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is absent on official business as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Air Force Academy.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is absent because of death in his family.

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the

Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 65, as follows:

[No. 66 Leg.]

YEAS—18

Anderson	Ellender	Mundt
Byrd, Va.	Gruening	Pearson
Carlson	Lausche	Thurmond
Clark	McClellan	Tower
Curtis	Morton	Williams, Del.
Dirksen	Moss	Young, Ohio

NAYS—65

Aiken	Hayden	Miller
Allott	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Bartlett	Hill	Morse
Bayh	Holland	Muskie
Beall	Humphrey	Nelson
Boggs	Inouye	Pastore
Brewster	Jackson	Pell
Burdick	Johnston	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Randolph
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Ribicoff
Case	Keating	Robertson
Cooper	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott
Dodd	Kuchel	Simpson
Dominick	Long, Mo.	Smith
Douglas	Long, La.	Sparkman
Eastland	Mansfield	Stennis
Edmondson	McCarthy	Symington
Ervin	McGovern	Talmadge
Fong	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Gore	McNamara	Young, N.Dak.
Hart	Mechem	

NOT VOTING—17

Bennett	Hartke	Neuberger
Bible	Hruska	Prouty
Church	Javits	Russell
Engle	Magnuson	Smathers
Fulbright	McGee	Yarborough
Goldwater	Metcalf	

So the amendment of Mr. YOUNG of Ohio was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to table that motion.

The motion to table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGOVERN in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I note that title IV of the supplemental appropriation bill is an amendment to the Phillippine Rehabilitation Act of 1963, an act approved by Congress last year I assume, after thorough consideration by the Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill having been reported by those committees and acted upon by both Houses. Now, quite suddenly, we find in the supplemental appropriation bill a title which has the effect of significantly modifying that legislation.

So far as I know, there has been no explanation on the floor of the Senate as to why this amendment was included. No justification has been made for it. Senators know that this subject has been under discussion during the past 6 weeks or 2 months, but the Wall Street Journal for April 30 contains an article which I believe raises some significant questions about the wisdom or propriety of the recommended changes.

I should like to ask some member of either the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Foreign Relations, since I assume the amendment was recommended to the Committee on Appropriations by the Committee on Foreign Relations, whether we may have some clarification. The Wall Street Journal, in the opening paragraph of its article, states:

> Goaded by charges that generous agents for Philippine war damage claimants subverted the legislative process, the Senate is ready to gamble up to $25 million to deny a lobbyist legal fees of perhaps $300,000.

I do not know whether that statement has ever been substantiated. It is said that we are taking a gamble on the possible loss of up to $25 million out of the Federal Treasury on the proposal that $73 million be given to the Philippine Government, leaving it up to that government to distribute or use the funds as it sees fit.

What is the judgment of Senators who are members of the Committee on Appropriations or of the Committee on Foreign Relations as to whether that is a proper estimate? Is there a chance that the U.S. Government will lose $5, $10, or $20 million as a result of the proposed change in the law?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, for the answer to that specific question, I shall yield in a moment to the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. However, in explanation of the amendment, I refer the Senator from Minnesota to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, April 26, 1963, when the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] made a quite prolonged and detailed explanation of the resolution which was adopted by the Committee on Foreign Relations and the recommendation made to the Committee on Appropriations, which was adopted and became title 4 of the bill.

With respect to the article which was published in the Wall Street Journal of yesterday, to the effect that by giving all this money directly to the Philippine Government, rather than by paying the money directly to the claimants, the U.S. Government would necessarily lose thereby approximately $20 million. I yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in that connection, I know of no justification for a figure of $20 million that the U.S. Government might lose. In all fairness, it should be said that when the subject was before the Senate last year, two bills were considered. One bill provided for the payment of $73 million directly to the Philippine Government, to be used by that Government as it saw fit. That was in keeping with the original act of 1946, which provided for the rehabilitation of the Philippines, rather than for the settlement of individual claims. However, the administration of the fund that was originally made available was on the basis of individual claimants.

Therefore, when we came to consider the supplemental amount of $73 million, there were two divergent views. One was that we should pay that amount directly to the Philippine Government and let that Government use it as it saw fit, upon the original basis of its being for the rehabilitation of the Philippines.

There was another school of thought which held that since individual claimants had already established their claims, the money should be made available to the individual claimants.

Mr. Harriman, who was Assistant Secretary of State for the Far East at that time, testified before our committee that the State Department was willing to accept either bill. We were told that the Philippine Government was willing to take either bill. Mr. Harriman said it was believed that some of the claimants may have moved or died, their claims may have expired, and that the U.S. Government might save a few million dollars. I do not remember that he gave an exact amount.

Mr. MCCARTHY. He said $4 to $5 million.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is the reason why there is no basis for a figure of $20 million. I do not know where that figure came from.

At that time we did not know that there had been active agitation on the part of two former Commissioners and I believe the counsel or comptroller of the Commission to get the names and addresses of claimants and the amounts they were claiming, so that they would be ready to present their claims as soon as the bill became law. It was not until, incident to the investigation carried on by the Committee on Foreign Relations into the nondiplomatic activities of foreign governments, that it was discovered that large fees had been made payable as a result of the agitation and trumping up of business by two former Commissioners and a third official of the Commission.

Frankly, the committee was shocked. As it happened, I was presiding over the committee when the original bill was considered. I myself preferred the claimant bill, but I did so on the basis of what Mr. Harriman testified, namely, that the U.S. Government might save money by it. However, in all frankness, had I known that the former Commissioners were taking advantage of the positions they held and the information they had obtained as Commissioners, together with the other officials, I certainly would not have voted for that bill; I would have voted for the bill which would have provided payment directly to the Philippine Government.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Does the fact that that kind of promotion took place in any way change the substance or merit of the bill which was passed last year? Are we to accept this proposal because it has been discovered that someone who was involved in promoting the bill withheld information from us or has not been a good man—if that is the case? Is this proposal intended to make null and void everything that has been done? Are we to say that because we do not like the lobbyist, even though the idea is a good one, we will reverse ourselves and retract what we did, after full consideration and belief that it was the right thing to do? Is it that we have found a Jonah, so we will throw him overboard?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It was not with full information that the committee

acted last year. One of the former commissioners testified before the Committee on Foreign Relations. None of us knew that he was representing the claimants. In fact, I asked him the question. He said he was representing sugar planters.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think that is incidental. The fact that the committee did not have full information about him does not in any way affect the substance of the legislation the Congress approved.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We could have passed either bill. I think the committee could have acted in either way. Our own Government said it was satisfied to have the legislation either way. The Philippine Government made it known to us that they would accept it either way. Certainly, we would not have passed the legislation we passed had we known that this condition prevailed.

The Committee on Foreign Relations decided by a vote of all the members then present—I do not recall the number who were present—in favor of this proposal. I understand that the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the ranking Republican member, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], presented the matter to the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Appropriations made this change.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the record ought to be crystal clear, regardless of what we do—and no one is being fooled concerning what this is about—that the administration recommended the language of the bill Congress passed in August 1962.

Mr. McCARTHY. Last year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. Last year. The administration did not want to make direct payment to the Philippine Government for reasons that the administration explained in executive session.

The administration recommended the direct payment to individuals because that would permit the Foreign Claims Commission to analyze each claim, rather than turn over a lump sum of $73 million to the Philippine Government, not knowing how the money would be used. That is why we passed that proposed legislation. So let us not deceive ourselves on this issue.

If this lobbyist is to be chastised—and there is very good reason for doing so—that can be done by means of a resolution providing that none of the money shall go to any lobbyist or to any person formerly employed by the Foreign Claims Commission representing any claimant. But if we seek to prevent a lobbyist from being paid, let us repeal the Sugar Act and similar laws. We need corrective legislation and I shall vote for it; yes, I shall support the committee language but I prefer to strengthen it along the lines I have suggested.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope that will be done.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It was lobbying in connection with the Sugar Act which set off this effort. That is what caused some Senators, including the distinguished Senator from Illinois, to propose that this investigation be made; and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] felt that that should be done. He laid the matter before the Foreign Relations Committee; and then it was laid before the Senate, and the investigation was authorized.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas were now in the Chamber, I am sure he would say that that act was not what set off the investigation. He had begun the work even before the Senate was considering the Sugar Act, although when the Sugar Act was under consideration he had something to say about this matter.

Certainly it could have been handled in the way that similar matters have been handled in the past. But since the administration chose to seek to obtain some 2 million tons of sugar in the open market, that brought up the question here; and I believe we welcomed those who came to testify before our committee in behalf of allocations for various countries. I saw nothing improper in doing so. If we were to deny them the right to appear before the congressional committees, we would then be entirely dependent upon the executive branch for information in regard to a problem of great importance.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I was present in the Appropriations Committee when a very dignified presentation of this matter was made by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who was accompanied there by the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

I remember very well the two principal points which were the basis of their request that this amendment be added to the bill. First, it was felt that the conduct of the lobbyist had amounted to a flagrant abuse of the Foreign Agents Registration Act, and that it could not be allowed to go unnoticed. Second, the only way that appeared to be open for the enactment of such remedial legislation in time to prevent the payment of the funds, which were ready to be paid in such a way that the lobbyists would be able to capitalize upon their violation of the Foreign Agents Registration Act, was to add this amendment as a rider to the pending bill; and immediate enactment was needed in order to deal adequately with the various emergency problems which were faced by many governmental agencies.

I am sure that is correct. I see in the Chamber at this time the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]; and if I have misstated the matter in any way, I hope he will correct me. But I believe those were their two reasons; and I believe I am stating correctly the attitude of the Appropriations Committee in connection with its willingness to follow what I understand was the unanimous attitude of the Foreign Relations Committee in connection with the request that this amendment be added as a rider to the appropriation bill. It seemed to me, as one member of the committee, that that situation required the action which was requested.

If I am in error in my statement of the facts, I hope the distinguished Senator from Iowa will correct me.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield, to permit me to reply to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from Florida is correct.

There are some additional reasons, which would be rather painful to bring up in open session; but in view of the way the situation is developing, I am afraid that some of the details will have to be brought out, so that the public may know the circumstances surrounding the surreptitious actions in connection with this piece of proposed legislation.

But the Senator from Florida is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, as I recall, there was no very serious debate on the floor of the Senate when this matter was presented to us by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. At that time there was no particular movement on the floor of the Senate to have this proposal enacted into law. We accepted that recommendation generally in the way in which it came to us from the Foreign Relations Committee; and I supported it largely on that basis—largely on the belief that the best way to obtain relief in connection with this matter was to proceed in the way proposed, rather than to have the matter go through a foreign government.

Is there any assurance in regard to how the $73 million would be disbursed by the Philippine Government?

Mr. PASTORE. There is no such assurance.

Mr. McCARTHY. So we do not know whether one dime of this money would be used for the purpose intended. I say such a situation is the height of fiscal irresponsibility. If we wish to provide this much relief to people in the Philippines, let us vote for it directly.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, my answer tc that suggestion is that the U.S. Government has never actually acknowledged that it owes the amounts claimed. Those matters were covered in the original act, for purposes of the authorization.

Then this situation was developed, on the ground that this money was owed because of the damage done to property by those who acted for the U.S. Government.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island has stated the situation correctly.

Mr. McCARTHY. But what the Senator has said still does not answer the question of whether we wish to provide the Philippine Government $73 million to be usec for its general purposes, or whether we wish to have the money go to those who suffered the losses. We

are told that this proposal does not indicate in any way how the money will be distributed in the Philippines.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Let me ask whether the Senator from Minnesota was as shocked as I was to find that Members of the Senate were smeared by publicity to the effect that they had received campaign contributions in return for supporting this Philippine money bill—a claim which all of us know is false. I know that some of those whose names were publicized in connection with their having received contributions from Mr. O'Donnell never knew the man, and never knew that contributions contributed to their campaign came from him. Yet this investigation of lobbying has resulted in this kind of smear of some of our colleagues both in the Senate and in the House. I think it is disgraceful.

Mr. McCARTHY. There is no question that that point was raised in the minds of many when the whole subject was presented to the public.

Mr. GRUENING. Those who had any part in bringing it to the press itself owe an apology to the Senators who were smeared.

Mr. McCARTHY. Since we accepted pretty much what the Committee on Foreign Relations presented to us when the amendment was recommended, the information would feed back to that committee from some of the members of the committee.

Mr. President, I make a point of order against the inclusion of the language under discussion in the supplemental appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I believe there is a motion at the desk to suspend the rule. In accordance with the written notice which I filed with the Senate on April 24, 1963, I hereby move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI so that I may then propose to the supplemental appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, House Resolution 5517, the amendment relating to the Philippine Rehabilitation Act, which has just recently been deleted from the bill on a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island to suspend the rule. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Chair inform the Senate as to the issue which is now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICEER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island to suspend the rule so as to permit the offering of the amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, do I understand that the 40-minute allocation of time applies to the debate on the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Who will control the time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, it is, of course, regrettable that the issue must be raised at this time. Having been rather closely associated with the hearings, the facts, the implications, and the connotations behind this particular activity, I shall endeavor to clear the atmosphere.

First, the bill which proposed to appropriate $73 million to the Philippines was introduced in 1960 under the previous administration. It proposed to pay the money to the Philippine Government. That bill did not clear the Congress. In 1962, under the new administration, the bill was again introduced by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in the same form in which it had been filed previously.

This bill had struck a snag in the House for some then unknown reason.

A different bill, one paying claimants, failed to pass in the House and an international incident was created. The President of the Philippines threatened to and did cancel his trip to this country, and relations between the Philippines and the United States were seriously impaired at that time because the Philippines charged us with bad faith.

The administration now in power became greatly concerned that a bill be passed.

A bill providing payment to the Philippine Government was ruled out in the other body. No one knew quite why.

The information that I am about to mention is not yet in the RECORD, but I assure Senators that there is ample reason to know that word went from powerful Members of the other body that unless the State Department and the administration accepted the bill as it was altered to make the $73 million payments to individual claimants rather than to the Philippine Government, there would be no bill at all, and the international complications that had arisen as the result of the failure to pass the original bill in the House would continue.

Representatives from the State Department said, "We will take that bill then if we cannot get the other one through the House. If we must go the route of paying to individual claimants, we will take it, because the situation is serious."

The bill was passed in the House, came over here, was passed in the Senate, and became the law which is on the books today.

I have in my hands a copy of the Wall Street Journal of the 30th of April. The article on the subject is not factually well based. It states that there is some possibility of saving $25 million if the bill were to provide payment to individual claimants as against the proposed change in the application of the money. There is not the slightest degree of evidence of that. That idea is completely wrought out of whole cloth and the fiction of someone's imagination.

There is a possibility that $1 million out of $73 million might be saved. But there is no assurance whatever. Perhaps slightly more than $1 million might be saved. Perhaps $2 million. But the possibility is in a highly speculative field. The latest word on that point is from the Foreign Claims Commission itself no later than today. So where the figure of $25 million originated, I do not know. But certain Members have taken it as gospel and have alleged it on the floor of the Senate. There is no foundation for that.

The Committee on Foreign Relations was not necessarily looking into this particular case, nor was it examining any particular individual as a target. The Committee on Foreign Relations was looking into the Foreign Agents Registration Act to determine, first, whether or not it was sufficient; second, if it were sufficient, was it being complied with? If the act were not sufficient, in order to protect the international associations between foreign principals and local representatives, corrective measures might be offered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

As an incident in some ways to the investigation, the fantastic, interesting, and in many ways reprehensible situation was developed in which thousands of dollars was used by certain lobbyists who were profiting, as the chairman pointed out the other day, and would eventually stand to profit, if the measure were enacted through, in a total amount of over $1 million for filing and collecting claims, many of which had already been filed among the so-called church claims, and others of which have been solicited. I do not know whether the claims were solicited by lawyers or lobbyists. If they solicited them as lawyers, those who did so have violated the canon of ethics as lawyers. If they took off their hats as lawyers and put on lobbyists' hats, perhaps they had the right to do so. I do not know. But the claims were solicited by former members of the Commission whose seats had not even become cold when they got off the Commission. They were out drumming up business by international cable, letter, and other contacts to solicit the claims of these people. Then they got busy and stirred up the idea that the United States might be induced to put up $73 million for rehabilitation purposes, but their purpose was to pay it to individuals on individual claims, because they were developing contracts with the individual claimants, and those contracts have been listed in the RECORD. They used a substantial amount of money.

I do not like to see names of Members of Congress or names of other persons brought in. I think the overwhelming number of Members of Congress who have received contributions from time to

time, and who have reported them, have been perfectly honest and have acted in perfectly good faith. Nevertheless, the RECORD shows some $18,000 flowing into the hands of lobbyists for the purpose of aiding "our friends" in the Congress of the United States. Those facts were not developed in the hearings on the bill.

One of these men came before the committees of the House and Senate, presenting himself as a former member of the Philippine War Damage Commission, and therefore connoting that he was in a special position of sympathy for and knowledge of the poor people in the Philippines—and many of them did suffer—but he never once disclosed that he was a lobbyist who had solicited business for revenue, based upon his service in the Government. So far as I know, the only thing that saves his hide today up to a certain point is the statute of limitations. He never disclosed his own personal interest in this subject or his own pecuniary interest, or that of his fellow member on the Commission who was equally busy in the Philippines soliciting these claims.

The original purpose of the act, as clearly shown, was not necessarily to pay directly to original claimants. In the inception it was said to be impractical at the time to weed out individual claimants, but it was said that the $73 million should be put into the Philippines as an additional and final rehabilitation contribution.

Yet someplace in the bill's travels from that body to this body, and from certain individuals on the other side of the Capitol to the State Department, the story went out that it was necessary to take the individual claim payment route or there would be no bill. Meanwhile, an international incident had occurred when the House failed to pass the original bill and the Philippines charged us with bad faith.

This situation stinks. How any Senator could stand on this floor and defend it I do not know. It is not a case of denying to some poor little claimants their claims. We are talking about $73 million that the U.S. Government is to provide in addition to the rehabilitation arrangements we made several years ago.

I can well understand that the beneficiaries of this "boodle fund" which came from the Philippines and was passed in conduit through the Philippine Embassy to certain lobbyists, and in turn distributed as largess and bounty, might have a feeling of friendship and cordiality toward the legislation as it was passed. I can understand that, but there are a few other things I still cannot understand.

What was the motivating influence behind the shift in policy in respect to the bill? That is something which certainly the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate did not know and I am quite certain that a majority, at least, of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House did not know.

There were some things which were concealed. This was a racket, and a concealed racket. The administration did not know it. The State Department did not know it. It was not revealed until, almost collaterally and incidentally to a broader investigation by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the facts did turn up, inevitably, in an examination of the record and the conduct of certain registrants who were suspected of having failed to comply with the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

This is a flagrant case. It is a flagrant case of misuse of friendship, a flagrant case of deliberate withholding of personal interest by witnesses before committees of the Congress, which amounts to complete deception so far as the motives and inspiration of the witnesses are concerned when they testify.

It is a case of a few individuals lobbying constantly and I may say effectively—a few individuals who have not only already greatly enriched themselves, but also stand to enrich themselves to a far greater degree unless we alter the legislation. This would not prevent the money from going into the Philippines. The money would go into the Philippines, but the money would be prevented from going through this very questionable route which has now been revealed—the very questionable route of direct payment, based upon which the malefactor in this case will reap great benefit.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think the Senate and the Congress are obligated to purge themselves from any suspicion of undue influence in connection with this matter.

I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. Did the three former officials—two members of the Commission and a chief examiner—who later appeared in the representation of these claimants register as agents of those foreign claimants under the terms of the Act?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The record shows, from the testimony, that they did not register for the claimants themselves. I think at least one of them registered as a representative of certain sugar interests in the Philippines, but not of the claimants themselves. That was never disclosed.

Mr. President, I do not wish to trespass further on the time of the Senate. I yield the floor, and perhaps will use a minute or so later.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, what is the time situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The Senator from Rhode Island has 5 minutes remaining. Twenty minutes remain on the other side.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may need.

I agree with much of what the Senator from Iowa has said about the Foreign Agents Registration Act. There has been an indication of the need for a revision of that act.

I think one of the most serious questions raised as a result of the inquiry and the information which has been developed with relation to it is how money from a foreign country can be used for political contributions in the United States without being subject to the same limitations which would apply, let us say, to an American corporation, or to an American labor union, or to an individual who wished to contribute. To be able to bring in money from a foreign country, to sequester it and to make contributions from it to men who do not know the source, is a serious matter.

But I do not think the findings justify the kind of violent action we are asked to take with a basic claims bill, in regard to which we find ourselves asked to approve the transfer of $73 million to a foreign government without any indication as to how that $73 million will be used.

If we are concerned about the action of a lobbyist, about the Foreign Agents Registration Act, or about how money is first gathered and then distributed, those are all matters which deserve the attention of the Senate and of the Congress.

But I do not see that these questions justify the proposal before the Senate today of radically changing the way in which the Philippine Rehabilitation Act is to be carried out.

I believe there are several points about this proposal which should be considered. First, it is not clear that promoting support of this legislation was illegal. Second, there is no reason to believe that the contributions which were made in any way affected the decision of any Member of Congress. Third, this action would indicate a lack of confidence in the Foreign Relations Committee by the Senate, if not by the committee itself. Finally, there is strong testimony that the proposal recommended here to change the method of payment will cost the United State from $5 to $25 million more than it would cost if the individual claims were paid directly.

It is my intention, if the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island is defeated—that is, if he does not secure the necessary two-thirds vote—to move that the rule be suspended and that an amendment be adopted to this effect: That, notwithstanding any preceding law, no remuneration shall be paid, directly or indirectly, to any former Commissioner or employee of the Philippine War Damage Commission, as compensation for any services rendered in the future in connection with any application filed under this act.

It seems to me that, as clearly as possible under these circumstances, such language would reach the very point which the Senator from Iowa has been raising and which was raised in the hearings in connection with this whole inquiry.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am willing to yield back my time if the Senator will yield back his time. Is that satisfactory?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I wish to yield to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I take only a moment to let the RECORD show my own difficulty with respect to the vote soon to be had. Unfortunately, I was not able to attend the hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on this subject, and therefore do not express views based upon that hearing. I point out that I was not in favor of the appropriation in the first place.

This particular amendment causes me worry. It seems to me it has some of the elements of an act of attaint. I realize that activities have been engaged in by lobbyists who were former members of the Philippine War Damage Commission which assault our consciences. I am not sure that justifies action which smacks of conviction without trial; which may be considered ex post facto.

It seems to me, under all the circumstances, the best course the Congress could follow would be to rescind the appropriation entirely. Then Congress could examine the question de novo. Then it could appropriate, or not appropriate, with whatever assurances the Congress might desire with respect to the beneficiaries. I do not now offer that amendment because the question before the Senate is on suspension of the rule in order to enable the amendment to be offered to the bill.

These are not the only lobbyists who perform in a way that shocks the conscience of many people of good will, including many Members of Congress. I call attention to activities with respect to the sugar bill, and many others. I call attention to the need for thoroughgoing legislation with respect to political campaign contributions and expenditures. We need not only regulation of political expenditures, but limitation of political contributions. But it is now proposed that the Senate deal only with a particular element of two or more problems; and I doubt very much if this is a wise course. At least, I shall not vote to suspend the rule. I would vote for an amendment to rescind the appropriation entirely. Then Congress could consider the matter on its merits.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Tennessee that, if the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island is defeated, as I hope it will be, I intend to ask that the rule be suspended so that I may offer an amendment which will provide that, notwithstanding any existing provisions of law, no remuneration shall be paid, directly or indirectly, to any former Commissioner or employee of the Philippine War Damage Commission as compensation for any services to be rendered in the future in connection with any application filed under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I hold no brief or sympathy for persons who take advantage of a former position held in the U.S. Government. Particularly, I do not do so in this case, with respect to an appropriation which I did not favor. But I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that many men wearing stars on their shoulders leave the military service and join firms which are heavily engaged in defense contracts. I call attention to the fact that many men leave the employment of the Atomic Energy Commission and other agencies and do so. So this is not the only instance.

Thus we here pinpoint a small part of two or more problems with which we should be dealing on an overall basis. I did not rise with the expectation, or even the desire, that anyone be influenced by what my views are in this regard; but I felt that, since we are to have a rollcall vote, and I held these reservations, I should state my views.

Mr. McCARTHY. I commend the Senator's effort to broaden consideration of this matter so far as concerns persons who were formerly employed by the Government; but persons who were never employed by the Government carry on lobbying activities to the point where they go out and drum up business, as was said, with foreign governments to have certain bills passed. After action is taken, they represent foreign governments before various agencies of the Federal Government. We might name some of the most reputable law firms in the United States who take accounts with representatives of foreign governments for that purpose.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. I think it is despicable that a man would use his former or present Government position for his private gain. If the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island is defeated, I understand the Senator from Minnesota will offer an amendment that will provide that these lobbyists will obtain no funds whatever from this appropriation. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. THURMOND. Is the Senator sure the amendment is tight enough to accomplish that purpose?

Mr. McCARTHY. It would apply to any former commissioner or employee of the Philippine War Damage Commission, and any compensation he would receive for services rendered in connection with any application filed under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act.

Mr. THURMOND. As I understand, that was possibly the chief motive for including the present provision to the appropriation bill.

It was in revolt to the manner in which these people handled this matter in order to gain the former result.

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe that was the principal argument made. As I understood the remarks of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], that was the burden of the case which he made in the Senate a few minutes ago.

Mr. THURMOND. The amendment the Senator is offering would overcome that difficulty. If that were so, then the amendment would overcome the chief objection that has been raised to the proposal.

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe that would meet the objection, which I believe is a justifiable objection, and it would leave the other question of how the claims shall be adjusted and the procedures in which individual claims shall be received and the manner in which the money shall be paid. It will leave the matter as it has been determined in existing law.

Mr. THURMOND. I have doubts about paying the money to the Philippine Government. It is my feeling that if we can accomplish the purpose of the amendment, as the Senator has suggested, and not change the law so as to pay the money to the Government, it might be to our advantage to do so, because we can investigate each claim; whereas I am not sure that that would be done very carefully if we paid the money directly to the Philippine Government. It is probable that we could save several millions of dollars by our examining each claim. It is possible that some claims will never be submitted, and therefore we could save money by paying our money on those claims.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Under Secretary of State, Mr. Harriman, last year testified that we could probably save from $4 to $5 million, at least. That was a year ago. If other claims have been settled under existing Philippine claims legislation, the saving might be as high as $20 or $25 million. That is the estimate made in the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. THURMOND. If the Senator's amendment will accomplish that purpose, I shall vote for it. As far as the lobbyists are concerned, this is mere chicken feed. I have no sympathy with them, but this is really chicken feed compared with some of the other lobbyists for foreign governments. The present Under Secretary of State was a lobbyist for foreign governments. It might be interesting to the committee if it at some time were to look into the transactions of a former Secretary of State, who is now a lobbyist for foreign governments. These transactions ought to be looked into at some future time, particularly if these governments come before Congress asking for some money.

Mr. McCARTHY. Of course there are a great many big fish in the pond, which we pretend are not there. We have a small one now out in the open, and we suddenly pronounce severe judgment on it.

Mr. THURMOND. I wish it to be clearly understood that the little fish has been exposed and that we ought to punish it. The big fish ought to be punished also. So far as I am concerned, I favor looking into all these situations. However, I do have my doubts about paying this money to the Government of the Philippines rather than letting our own Government handle the claims. By doing so we might save some money and earn friends among the people.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is the most serious consideration connected with the amendment I have offered. The other issue that has been raised, about the lobbyists, I believe will be covered by the amendment which I propose to offer.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that even if a two-thirds vote on the motion were not secured, the Senator would be in the same place that the Senator representing the committee is in now. I mean by that the Senator from Minnesota would have to offer his amendment subject to a two-thirds vote. I suggest, further—and this is the principal reason for my rising—that if the rule is waived the distinguished Senator, with the germane amendment that he has, would have the right to offer it as a substitute for the

committee amendment. I suggest that would be the easiest, most direct, and correct way to get his amendment under consideration by the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to suggest that the Senator from Florida is eminently correct, because there is obviously something that needs to be done with reference to the situation. The question is how it should be done. I wish to clarify the record on one or two items. First, the so-called Philippine Rehabilitation Payment Act of August 30, 1962, was an amendment to the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946. What did the act of 1946 provide? It provided:

> Compensation shall be payable to qualified persons having, on December 7, 1941 (Philippine time), and continuously to and including the time of loss or damage, an insurable interest as owner, mortgagee, lien holder, or pledgee in such property so lost or damaged.

What needs to be established is that the act of 1962 was an amendment to the original Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946.

A lump sum payment to the Philippine Government is a variation from the practice and the standard that had been established in 1946.

Second, the request for the legislation did not come from any lobbyist. I never met this lobbyist in my life. The only man I met from the Philippine Islands who ever talked to me about this legislation was the distinguished statesman, patriot, and former Ambassador of the Philippines, Carlos Romulo, a man who has acceptance in this country second only to the President of the United States. General Romulo is a good man and an honest man. He would not deceive us. He is the only one whoever talked to me about it, other than the Secretary of State.

Two administrations supported compensation or claims legislation—the Eisenhower administration and the Kennedy administration.

I would have my colleagues in the Senate know that in 1959, the State Department—I repeat, in 1959—long before any bill was introduced, in a memorandum following the visit of President Garcia of the Philippines, issued a statement to the effect that the United States would pay the claims which the War Claims Commission had adjudged to be due to Philippine citizens. The Fulbright amendment—section 4 of the bill before us—would grant the $73 million to the Philippine Government. This may well be the only remedy we have in order to correct the deplorable situation which has been revealed as a result of our inquiry. But I do believe that direct payment to individuals after claims have been examined by the U.S. War Claims Commission—an agency of our Government, not the Philippines—is preferable. I believe it will be more honorable, efficient, and fair. But, I want to be sure that there will be no profiteering, no fixes, no exorbitant fees.

In the memorandum the Department of State said:

> The U.S. Government will, at the next regular session of the Congress and in connection with the legislative program for fiscal year 1961, request appropriate legislation enabling the settlement of the Philippine claim for payment of additional war damage compensation in accordance with the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 (Public Law 370, 79th Cong.). The amount of $73 million, according to the records of the War Damage Commission, reflects the statutory maximum of such unpaid private claims authorized by the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946.

Therefore, Mr. President, let us keep the record straight. No lobbyist talked to HUMPHREY. I did not need any lobbyist to talk to me. What is more, I was not in the Senate in 1946, when the earlier legislation was passed. I did not write the memorandum of 1959 from which I have just quoted. I know of no one that lobbied President Eisenhower, who made the original recommendations, or Secretaries of State Dulles or Herter. And, I don't recall that anyone lobbied President Kennedy or Secretary of State Rusk; nor did they consult with me.

The fact of the matter is—and let us have no doubts about it—that the Government of the United States recommended the legislation that we passed. The Secretary of State strongly recommended the legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, would it be permissible, by unanimous consent, to withdraw the quorum call on the point of order and put title 4 back in the bill without a point of order, and have it subject to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent that may be done.

Mr. PASTORE. Title 4 would be established without a point of order. It will be subject to amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me understand the request. Is it to consider title IV as properly in the bill, not subject to a point of order, and therefore subject to amendment?

Mr. PASTORE. Under limited debate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So there would be no requirement for a suspension of the rule or for a vote on the suspension of the rule.

My second question is, What amendments are proposed?

Mr. PASTORE. One amendment. Will the Senator from Minnesota read his amendment, on my time?

Mr. McCARTHY. My amendment reads:

> Notwithstanding any provision of existing law, no remuneration shall be paid, directly or indirectly, to any former commissioner or employee of the Philippine War Damage Commission as compensation on account of services in connection with any application filed under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, that language is not worth the paper it is written on. Those contracts were made with citizens of the Philippines, which is a sovereign nation. The claims were tested under Philippine law as contractual matters. They cannot be inhibited by action of the U.S. Congress.

Mr. PASTORE. All that is necessary is to reject the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I want to be certain that we are not going to compound the mistake.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I have 4 minutes remaining. I yield the entire 4 minutes to the minority leader.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, is a unanimous-consent request pending?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. What is the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. PASTORE. None has been agreed to; but the minority leader wishes to make a speech, and I have yielded him my 4 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, these remarks are not being made on my time. I shall be brief.

Along with the majority leader and other Senators, I was called into conference on this subject. I participated and cooperated in trying to put this situation in a good light, so that everyone would be satisfied. A suggestion was made that we get in touch with the Philippine Government, and that was done.

Second, it was agreed that the original act should be amended.

Third, it was pretty well agreed that one of the objects of the amendment was the man O'Donnell, who had scattered checks rather freely. Let us take the cover off the ball: Quite a number of Senators and Representatives received money. So an attempt was made to put this situation in a good light, knowing that it would break on the front page—and it did break on the front page.

I think the committee acted wisely in filing a motion to suspend the rule and then offering the proposed language, because I believe everyone was pretty well agreed upon the procedure. So there the situation stands now.

If it is proposed to put the knife into this lobbyist——

Mr. PASTORE. No one is going to put a knife into anyone. The Senator from Rhode Island will support the resolution as adopted by the Committee on Foreign Relations. All we are doing now is obviating the necessity for a two-thirds vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am talking about the language proposed to be offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. PASTORE. The Senate has a right to repudiate it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly; and that is the only point I am making. The proposal of the junior Senator from Minnesota is not worth the paper it is written on. The man Delgado and the Commissioner, and their associates, made contracts with the claimants.

To begin with, this was not a claimants' bill; it was a rehabilitation bill. So if there is some money left over for the Philippines, that will follow the original principle as determined by the Treasury Department, the State Department, and the Bell Mission. I was a Member of Congress at the time the Philippine Rehabilitation Act was enacted, and had a little something to do wih it. So we are not departing from principle. I merely do not want to confuse the situation now.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will yield on the time of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. The danger in the amendment now being proposed is that we would be setting a precedent that

when the United States liberates a country—which is what we did in the Philippines—we will subject ourselves to claims. I hope the Senate will not set that precedent this afternoon.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I share the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island. I believe it would be a colossal blunder to adopt the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Minnesota, because the courts of the Philippines would become clogged with claims. Perhaps the Philippine government would even ask our own Department of Justice to lend counsel as amicus curiae.

Mr. President, I prefer to wash the business up right now and follow the recommendation of the committee.

Mr. MCCARTHY. The language of my amendment is essentially the same as that of the amendment that was before the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, but the insuring language in the amendment is surplusage.

Mr. PASTORE. The fact is that the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota obviates the payment of money directly to the Philippine government. We are confronted with a serious question. It might be true that the amendment in the bill would cost the United States Government $2 million or $3 million more because some of the supposed claimants are dead, have moved away, or cannot be found. But I ask, What is wrong with that? The United States has gone into many countries and liberated the people. I hope that that will not subject the American taxpayers to damage suits. That is what we did in the Philippines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays on the present proposal be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I shall be glad to vote on this issue.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Very well. Let us vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] has asked that his point of order be vacated, which means, in the progession of the legislative process, that the order for the yeas and nays would be vacated.

The majority leader has asked unanimous consent that the Senate forgo a yea-and-nay vote and that we subsequently merely include in the bill the present title—I believe it is title IV—which will then be subject to amendment. It seems to me that that is the sensible way to proceed. I ask Senators to accommodate us in following that procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is the request inclusive of the rescission of the order for the yeas and nays?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I offer my amendment as a substitute for title IV of the bill now before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Notwithstanding any provision in existing law, no remuneration shall be paid, directly or indirectly, to any former Commissioner or employee of the Philippine War Damage Commission as compensation on account of services in connection with any application filed under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is absent on official business as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Air Force Academy.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 58, as follows:

[No. 67 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Bartlett	Edmondson	Humphrey
Bayh	Engle	Inouye
Byrd, Va.	Fong	Kennedy
Cannon	Gruening	Long, La.
Clark	Hart	Long, Mo.
McCarthy	Monroney	Randolph
McGovern	Moss	Thurmond
McIntyre	Nelson	Young, Ohio
McNamara	Neuberger	

NAYS—58

Aiken	Ervin	Pastore
Allott	Gore	Pearson
Anderson	Hayden	Pell
Beall	Hickenlooper	Proxmire
Bible	Hill	Ribicoff
Boggs	Holland	Robertson
Brewster	Jackson	Russell
Burdick	Johnston	Saltonstall
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Simpson
Carlson	Jordan, N.C.	Smith
Case	Keating	Sparkman
Church	Kuchel	Stennis
Cooper	Lausche	Symington
Cotton	Mansfield	Talmadge
Curtis	McClellan	Tower
Dirksen	Mechem	Williams, Del.
Dominick	Miller	Williams, N.J.
Douglas	Morton	Young, N. Dak.
Eastland	Mundt	
Ellender	Muskie	

NOT VOTING—16

Bennett	Javits	Prouty
Dodd	Kefauver	Scott
Fulbright	Magnuson	Smathers
Goldwater	McGee	Yarborough
Hartke	Metcalf	
Hruska	Morse	

So Mr. MCCARTHY's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island regarding the supplemental appropriation request for the public works acceleration program. Am I correct in assuming that the approval of these funds for the public works acceleration program will not be allowed in any way to prejudice building projects which have already been authorized under the General Services Administration program or for which funds will be appropriated in the General Services Administration budget for fiscal year 1964?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Ohio is absolutely correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations, to which H.R. 5517 was referred, recommended the allowance of $1 million for the Migrant Health Act—Public Law 87-692—which was passed in the last Congress.

The committee recommendation of $1 million, is a reduction of $500,000 from the supplemental estimate, and an increase of $500,000 over the House allowance.

These funds are critically needed for project grants to State health agencies to pay part of the cost of establishing and operating critically needed family health clinics for domestic migratory farm families. I, therefore, wish to express my gratitude to the Appropriations Committee, and to the senior Senator from Rhode Island, for restoring $500,000 of the $1 million reduction of the House allowance.

Mr. President, applications for funds under the Health Act received by HEW from 24 States indicate an overall need

in excess of $2 million. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from HEW explaining in detail the need for adequate funds for fiscal year 1963.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1963.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: In response to your inquiry, there is demonstrated minimum need for $1.5 million in fiscal year 1963 for support of health services under the Migrant Health Act (Public Law 87–692).

Applications received to date from agencies in 24 States request Federal support for a total of $2,135,000. Your attention is called to the attached table. Of this amount, it is estimated that $1.5 million will be recommended for approval in fiscal year 1963, as indicated above.

In view of these facts, it is apparent that the intent of Congress regarding the Migrant Health Act cannot be carried out without an appropriation commensurate with the need. We feel that it would be quite inaccurate to assume that the need relates only to the $200,000 in projects recommended for approval by the review committee at its first meeting in January 1963. The remainder of the $1.5 million is expected to be approved at the next meeting of the committee on May 9–10.

The delay in appropriating funds for the 1963 fiscal year has already caused great inconvenience and concern to State and local health departments and other applicant agencies. Further delay will make it impossible for some projects to get into operation during the 1963 crop season. This will mean postponement for another full year of health services which are greatly needed by migrants and which the migrant health legislation enacted last year was designed to provide.

Sincerely yours,
PAUL Q. PETERSON, M.D.,
Chief, Division of Community Health Services.

States from which statewide or local migrant health grant applications have been received, Apr. 29, 1963, and total amount requested

Arizona	$66,748
California	599,642
Colorado	57,433
Florida	122,452
Idaho	39,805
Illinois	67,760
Indiana	15,045
Iowa	5,800
Maryland	21,134
Michigan	52,788
Minnesota	6,230
New Jersey	130,669
New Mexico	1,300
New York	20,735
North Carolina	34,075
Ohio	64,649
Oregon	393,869
Pennsylvania	22,339
Puerto Rico	59,950
South Carolina	47,214
Texas	236,926
Virginia	4,920
Washington	60,479
West Virginia	7,050
Total	2,139,012

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the facts presented in this document indicate that further reductions in the appropriation allowance for Public Law 87–692 would make it exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, for the migrant health program to operate as the Congress intended.

Numerous State and local health agencies have requested funds and have taken great pains to develop health programs to benefit migrant farm families. Thus, a reduction of the present allowance of $1 million would not only make the migrant health program practically inoperable in the 1963 harvest season, but it would also impose an undue burden upon, and inconvenience, those States intending to participate in this worthwhile program.

In conclusion, let me reiterate my judgment that the $1 million allowance is absolutely critical to the effectiveness of the Migrant Health Act, and thank those responsible for insuring that this program will be in operation this summer and alleviate the serious, extensive health problems that confront our Nation's migratory farm families.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, as one of those who received a contribution in the amount of $100 from Mr. O'Donnell during my 1960 campaign, I want to make my position perfectly clear.

First of all I make absolutely no apology for this contribution. I do not know Mr. O'Donnell, nor did I have knowledge of his contribution to a Committee receiving funds for my campaign.

But even if I had known about this contribution, I would have accepted it.

I strongly resent any implication that by so doing, I would be yielding my judgment on any vote to come before the Senate.

My vote is not for sale on any issue no matter how many contributions I might have received from persons interested in that issue. I serve on the Senate Committee on Agriculture and many farmers have contributed to my campaign, but that does not mean that any particular farmer or farm group controls my vote.

I would not sell my vote for a million dollars to say nothing of selling out for a hundred bucks.

If Mr. O'Donnell has violated any statute, he should be dealt with accordingly. But Members of the U.S. Congress whose campaign committees innocently accepted contributions from him should not be criticized in any manner.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 12 O'CLOCK NOON TOMORROW

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, before the final vote on the bill, I should like to query the majority leader about the program for the remainder of the week and, insofar as he can state, for the first part of next week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader has had as much opportunity to look closely at the calendar as I have had, and I believe he has a pretty good idea of what the program is.

At the conclusion of the disposition of the pending business, it is the intention of the leadership to move to consider Calendar No. 127, Senate bill 537 to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States.

Following consideration of that bill, it is the intention to proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 136, Senate bill 102 to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for additional commissioners of the U.S. Court of Claims and for other purposes.

Following conclusion of the consideration of that bill, it is intended to proceed to Calendar No. 146, Senate bill 874 to authorize the construction and equipping of buildings required in connection with the operations of the Bureau of the Mint.

There will be only a pro forma session tomorrow. There will be no votes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM TOMORROW UNTIL 12 O'CLOCK ON MONDAY, MAY 6

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourn tomorrow, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. To repeat, there will be no votes tomorrow. There will be speeches, but nothing controversial.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 5517) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. PASTORE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. MUNDT conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMENDATION OF SENATOR PASTORE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before I yield the floor, I should like to take this occasion to compliment and commend the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who, in the past several weeks, has been in charge of a number of pieces of legislation which have been passed by this body. He has shown his usual skill, his usual enthusiasm, and his usual vigor. I desire him to know that the leadership is deeply appreciative to him for the generalship, understanding, and knowledgeability which he has shown. He is indeed a great credit to his State, to our country, and to our party.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader. He is always gracious and generous.

MISSOURI FIRST IN BOTH MAJOR LEAGUES

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, from time to time in recent years, the Senate has properly shown its concern for the vitality of our national pastime, baseball.

Therefore, as evidence that things were never better in major league baseball than they are today, at least from the viewpoint of the State of Missouri, I ask unanimous consent that today's standings in the American and National Leagues, as recorded in the Washington Daily News, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the standings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STANDINGS

AMERICAN LEAGUE

	W	L	Pct.	GB
Kansas City	12	7	.632	—
Boston	9	6	.600	1
New York	8	6	.571	1½
Baltimore	10	8	.556	1½
Los Angeles	11	10	.524	2
Chicago	7	7	.500	2½
Minnesota	9	10	.474	3
Detroit	8	10	.444	3½
Cleveland	5	8	.385	4
Washington	6	13	.316	6

NATIONAL LEAGUE

	W	L	Pct.	GB
St. Louis	14	6	.700	—
Pittsburgh	11	5	.688	1
Milwaukee	12	9	.571	2½
San Francisco	11	9	.550	3
Los Angeles	10	11	.476	4½
Chicago	9	10	.474	4½
Philadelphia	8	10	.444	5
Cincinnati	6	10	.375	6
New York	7	12	.368	6½
Houston	7	13	.350	7

AMENDMENT OF THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 127, Senate bill 537.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 537) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, no action will be taken on the bill tonight. I merely wish to have some business pending.

THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES AND SURVIVAL—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HUMPHREY BEFORE CONVENTION OF AMERICAN ORTHOPSYCHIATRIC ASSOCIATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on March 7, 1963, it was my privilege to address the 40th annual convention of the American Orthopsychiatric Association which met here in Washington.

This great assembly of behavioral scientists from all over the Nation considered, among other issues, the crucial problem of how best to apply the behavioral sciences in the major issues of war and peace.

REORGANIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE STUDY OF FEDERAL RESEARCH

It may be recalled that, for several years, the Senate Reorganization Subcommittee, of which I am privileged to be chairman, has made studies of overall research and development supported by the U.S. Government.

As one phase, we have focused on a relatively underemphasized area of research—the study of man, himself.

We have explored, for example, Department of Defense research on human motivation, human leadership, human reactions in combat, and on other issues. And we have looked in general at how civilian agencies study, how human beings learn, how they think, how they respond to neighbors, how they deal with friendship or hostility on the part of others.

These issues are not what is sometimes labeled "academic." They are issues which may involve the life of every home, every neighborhood, every community, and of the world itself.

It comes as no news to anyone to state that Government research has been essentially concerned with the study of things, rather than the study of man. In the interest of national survival, we have tended to concentrate on weaponry through the physical and engineering sciences.

But, we will prevent world war III not just by rockets, but by influencing what is in the minds of men on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S INTEREST

I am pleased to report that the President and his Office of Science and Technology have demonstrated, what I believe to be, the greatest interest ever shown at the highest levels of Government in the behavioral sciences.

A Behavioral Sciences Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee is now actively at work, following up on a previous excellent report which it had made to the President.

I congratulate the president, Dr. Jerome Wiesner, and the latter's staff and associates. They and we know, however, that this Government has a long way to go toward fully mobilizing the behavioral sciences in the interest of man's peace and freedom.

TWO TABLES ON SUPPORT OF HUMAN SCIENCES

As an indication, thereof, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the text of two tables showing how much, or, as it may be properly interpreted, how little, the U.S. Government has been spending for research and development in the behavioral sciences.

These figures were compiled by the National Science Foundation. With that agency's kind cooperation, I am publishing them in advance of their appearance in the forthcoming edition of Federal Funds for Science, the annual report in which the Foundation summarizes Federal science expenditures.

It should be borne in mind that the sums shown are very small in relation to the overall Federal budget of $14.7 billion for research, development, testing, and evaluation in the 1963 fiscal year.

I ask unanimous consent that, preceding this table, there appear the text of my address before the American Orthopsychiatric Association Convention.

There being no objection, the address and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES AND SURVIVAL

(Address by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, before convention of American Orthopsychiatric Association, Washington, D.C., March 7, 1963)

On March 4, 1933, a Nation, gripped with fear, heard Franklin Delano Roosevelt say, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

In March 1963, fear of a catastrophic depression has been eliminated to a great extent. Fortunately, this Nation is on the march to fuller prosperity.

But, fear of a different sort has increased. I refer to fear of international annihilation in a nuclear war.

You have assembled in our Nation's Capital to come to grips with this and other fears.

I welcome your vital role. You could hardly dedicate yourself to a greater goal.

World peace is the world's No. 1 priority. Reduction of tension is an indispensable precondition to an enduring peace.

You of this audience have dedicated your lives to understanding the minds of men and helping them to deal with their problems. It is you, then, to whom Government should turn to help provide answers on the complex problems of human and group relations in international affairs.

Our country urgently needs your counsel, advice, and judgment.

OUR DESTINY MUST NOT BE MUTUAL ANNIHILATION

Thirty years ago, Franklin Roosevelt said that this country "has a rendezvous with destiny."

And we do have a rendezvous in our time. But we should very specific about it. The rendezvous is not just with "destiny," because "destiny" implies alternatives; destiny can be either cruel or kind, favorable or unfavorable.

Today, we can tolerate no alternatives to peace.

Our destiny must—I emphasize "must"—be a triumphant one. Why? Because the alternative is no destiny at all. It could be international suicide in the ashes of a devastated planet.

We must conquer war, or war may obliterate mankind.

But, we must do more than silence guns.

MANKIND'S MANY FEARS

We must enable men to face up to still other stern realities of day-to-day existence.

Many fears plague mankind and the fears are not imaginary.

Hundreds of millions of people in the emerging nations fear a tomorrow as bleak or worse than the misery of their today and yesterday.

We must help these peoples conquer poverty, illiteracy, disease, malnutrition. Otherwise, mankind will fall prey to chaos and to those who would eagerly profit from chaos as a means to promote communism. We must above all help to instill hope.

A RENDEZVOUS WITH HUMANITY

In the remainder of the 1960's, this Nation has a rendezvous with humanity—suffering, downtrodden humanity.

Arnold Toynbee has stated that the 20th century marks the first time in human history that man could think of assisting his most distant neighbors.

In effect, for the first time in human history, we are in a position to enable all mankind to rendezvous with a kinder destiny.

We can assist the landless to gain land, the homeless to find shelter, the jobless to earn their own way, the humiliated to achieve dignity, the uneducated to learn, the hungry to be fed.

One such program is the historic Alliance for Progress. It will only succeed if there is a genuine alliance of human beings—not merely an alliance of diplomats, or of bankers, or of engineers—but of all human beings who have learned to communicate with one another, to understand one another, to help one another.

Here is but one of many challenges to leadership in the behavioral sciences and by the behavioral sciences.

Meanwhile, at home there is a rendezvous in the 50 States of this Union.

THE ILL-CLAD, ILL-HOUSED, ILL-FED

We can and must help our own people to achieve their highest birthright.

Once, Franklin Roosevelt saw "one-third of a nation ill clad, ill housed, ill fed." Today, our people are much better off.

But millions still live in substandard dwellings; millions lack proper nutrition. Despite our prosperity, there are still forgotten men.

You who study these problems, you who belong to the helping professions, must help your political leaders to remember and work for these forgotten people.

CHALLENGES IN HUMAN RELATIONS

Virtually everywhere we look, we see critical challenges in human relations: Deep racial tension, and not just in the South; millions of elderly, retired citizens, living not "golden years" but barren hours; violence in our midst—2½ million crimes committed in our land each year; a prison system which often breeds not "new men" but new offenses; avoidable bitterness in many of the relations between labor and management; anxiety because of job displacement, resulting from automation; 7½ million dropouts from high school, anticipated in the 1960's.

Every one of these problems can and must be met. None is insoluble. I do not, of course, assume that we can usher in "the millennium." But neither do I feel that we should accept these problems fatalistically as if they "will be with us forever."

The conditions I have outlined are stains on our society. They must be cleansed by action.

I urge you to bring to bear on these problems every bit of competence that you can offer, in cooperation with the Congress and the Federal agencies and with State and local government.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S PROGRAM

Legislation proposals on every one of these "fronts" are now pending before the Congress.

In the area of your deepest professional commitment, mental health, the boldest, most far-seeing program in American history has been offered by President John F. Kennedy.

His recommendations, for example, for community mental health centers throughout the United States hold tremendous promise for preventive, diagnostic, curative, and restorative therapy.

RAT RACE OR FULFILLMENT?

But mental health, as the President well knows, is not merely a matter of reducing the enormous population in mental institutions.

It is a matter of helping to uplift the sense of well-being of our population as a whole. It is a matter of helping individuals to find meaning and joy in the life which many Americans now characterize as merely a "rat race."

How, then, can we gain greater satisfaction and sense of purpose in our daily life and our national life? It will take more than gadgets and technology to make America greater still—as great as she can be. It will require more than increasing the gross national product and increasing the number of jobs, houses, schools, hospitals, playgrounds, roads, cultural centers, as important as these are. It will require that man learn more about man; that he gain a better understanding of himself.

True progress means more than understanding and controlling our physical environment. It means changing our social environment—abolishing, for example, urban blight and dealing effectively with suburban sprawl.

It means more than gleaming new buildings; it means making possible gleaming hearts and hopes. It means hands outstretched to help and to share.

Hands imply action. We need to get down to work to apply the knowledge which we already possess on helping human beings in distress.

I am pleased that so many of you in this association have a reputation for working to change things. We need people to build bridges from research to community programs.

The bridges must lead from scientific symposia to the halls of Congress, to Federal office buildings, State legislatures, city halls, school boards, chambers of commerce, trade unions, service clubs, PTA's, churches and temples, neighborhoods, street corners, and every other arena of opinion and action.

The united judgment of the psychiatric and allied healing arts must be heard from more than great conferences such as this, and but once a year. It must be heard and seen in action—in follow-through on the scene. That means wherever there is a battleground of social disorder or of human deprivation.

PROVIDE SHORT- AND LONG-RANGE ANSWERS

It is your job and mine to help find and provide answers to the great social problems now—this year—not just in some nebulous tomorrow.

I believe fervently in long-range planning and programing.

But there are millions of Americans who need our help now—today—and next month.

So, the question is not only: "How can we remedy the desperate scarcity of professional manpower in psychiatry by 10 years from now?"

We recognize that it takes that long to add skilled personnel through undergraduate and postgraduate education.

The question is also: "How can we make the best possible use of existing manpower and facilities right now? How can we adapt therapy, perhaps, so as to be able to get to some of the people waiting on the long lists for psychiatric and social work service—today?"

To be specific on just one small but terribly tragic social problem—some 25,000 Americans will commit suicide this year. They will be dead by next January 1. Long-range actions in 1965 will not save them.

But there is an infinite amount of other human heartbreak—of human anguish, today, in a vast variety of situations which commands our attention.

MOST AGENCIES DO NOT USE BEHAVIORAL SCIENTISTS

Fortunately, the U.S. Government is getting into action.

But, unfortunately, its direct use of the behavioral sciences, particularly psychology, tends to be confined to but one crucial agency—the National Institute for Mental Health.

I emphasize "direct," meaning, in this context, "action oriented" use.

In my judgment, the U.S. Government needs more behavioral science research, but it also needs to put the research to work in shirt-sleeves action.

One such action use, for example, has been the outstandingly successful role of psychologists in screening and training recruits for that great organization, the Peace Corps.

SMALL RATIO OF RESEARCH SUPPORT

A year and a half ago I directed the staff of the Reorganization Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, to analyze the extent to which the behavioral sciences receive support in our overall governmental research program. The staff reported that in the 1960 fiscal year: (a) The Federal Government was paying the bill for $1.9 billion in research and development; (b) of this sum, the behavioral sciences received only $65 million, or 4 percent. This disproportionately low ratio has hardly improved since then.

Current information compiled by the National Science Foundation shows that for the 1963 fiscal year, the Federal research allocation for human or behavioral sciences has increased to $83.8 million. This includes: $44.6 million in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; $20.4 million in the Department of Defense; and $10 million in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The National Institute for Mental Health is doing the broadest gaged job—both in research and in community programs.

The armed services are supporting research in leadership, in training, in human engineering. The Office of Education is studying learning, communication, motivation. The National Science Foundation is supporting basic research in psychology and sociology. The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation is studying adjustment of the handicapped.

But the grand total of all such Federal support is dismally small in relation to the backlog of need.

SPACE HAPPY OR EARTH SAD

We are all aware of other needs in the physical sciences. Space allocations are passing the $6 billion mark. This Nation has an important stake in the vast adventure in outer space.

But I know that I need not remind this audience that the most crucial space in the world is within the 3 pounds of the human brain.

It is in this "inner space" that we will find the key to man's fate.

You know how much is unexplored in the nature of man. You know how much this generation has suffered because man has not known how to live peaceably on this earth and enjoy it.

This Nation must not, therefore, lose its sense of perspective over the exotic vistas of the stars. We must not become space happy and earth sad.

There are 3 billion of us, spinning on this planet. There is no salvation for us on the Moon or Venus.

We must work out our salvation here on earth—through this most fantastic of instruments—the human mind.

NUCLEAR SWORD HANGS OVER MANKIND

We can only estimate what tragedy might lie ahead unless man can learn. A nuclear sword of Damocles hangs over mankind. Two weeks ago, I felt how slim is the thread that holds the sword, as I observed the deadlocked nuclear test ban negotiations in Geneva.

The behavioral sciences can help us resolve the awesome dilemmas we face.

We need them for what they know. We need them for research in what they do not know. And sometimes we need them just to tell us the difference.

For today, as in times past, the rulers of modern countries may still proceed on unfounded assumptions about the nature of man or the nature of the enemy.

BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES AND DISARMAMENT

A year ago, I called a roundtable conference with representatives of the Defense Department and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. I asked them to use the skill and eagerness of behavioral scientists, so as to explore peaceful answers to international tensions. Since then, as a result of my conference, a joint panel has been set up. But ACDA has had so slim a research budget that it has not felt it could spare a nickel for Federal support of behavioral research to date.

From every standpoint, this is highly regrettable. It is not just the physicist, the chemist, the biologist who can find new answers to the prevention of world war III; it is the psychiatrist, the psychologist, and allied professionals.

From all these people we need not only facts, we need questions. We need new concepts. We need challenges to cherished dogmas. We need imagination.

I urge you not to relax your individual and collective efforts to see that national decisions are made with the benefit of what we know about people—about human behavior.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS THAT SHOULD BE TAKEN

The highest scientific office of this land—the Office of the President's Science Adviser—is keenly aware of this need. Although a physical scientist, like all of his predecessors, Dr. Jerome Wiesner has given more impetus to high-level use of behavioral scientists than at any previous time.

He and his able staff are, however, aware of the persistent "behavioral science gap" in Government. He knows that, although long committed to the concept, the President's Science Advisory Committee still has no behavioral scientist; the Federal Council for Science and Technology still has no behavioral science committee.

An outstanding report by Professor Neil Miller's panel did represent a landmark. Behavioral scientists have been used in other presidential panels. But continuity and action-orientation have often been lacking.

Fortunately, the underrepresentation and underactivity of the behavioral sciences in the National Academy of Sciences is now being improved. The Academy will soon announce a new program for the behavioral sciences.

Let me add this point with respect to the Academy.

CONGRESS SHOULD USE NATIONAL ACADEMY

In these days the Congress, itself, is much interested in the problem of securing counsel from scientists. Many of the individual committees of the Congress have long used scientific panels or individual consultants. The record of congressional hearings contains considerable testimony by behavioral scientists on at least some of the key issues.

But both continuity and better representation of the behavioral sciences in the legislative branch are needed. A logical source to which we should turn is the National Academy.

I learned to my surprise the other day that the National Academy of Sciences is available—not only for responses to "spot" requests, as I always knew, but for definitive reports of the type the Academy has furnished to the President and the Federal agencies.

The Congress remembers that the Academy was set up by President Lincoln as an advisory group to the President, and that it has served the executive departments on many occasions. But the Congress should now recognize that it, too, can use the Academy as a major resource "of its own"—so to speak. This means as an aid to the fulfillment of its constitutional responsibilities—as both a coequal partner of the executive branch and as a check and balance.

Since legislators try to be directly responsive to human needs, it is logical for representatives of the behavioral sciences to play a prominent part in any such program. I pledge you that this political scientist will work to that end.

NEED IN U.S. STATE DEPARTMENT

I will work to the end too, that behavioral science shall be better represented in U.S. foreign relations.

There should be a behavioral scientist in the Office of the Science Adviser to the Secretary of State. Behavioral scientists ought to be present as high-ranking officers in American embassies abroad. Behavioral scientists ought to serve as science attachés abroad.

The State Department has used life scientists—biologists and physicians, but not behavioral scientists to date.

The Department should reach out for this crucial body of skills and insight. It should use them—not just for preparing reports—but for "on-the-firing-line" decision-making in day-to-day challenges.

Meanwhile, in conjunction with the U.S. Information Agency, task forces in the State Department should give objective study to the manner in which the Russians and Communist Chinese are or are not successful in their use of psychology in the cold war.

DEALING WITH NORMAL MEN OR PARANOIDS

The often tragic history of the 20th century to date reveals that international affairs have been in the hands of some men of great ability and of many men of mediocre or almost no ability.

What is more significant, however, history reveals that on occasion, world affairs have been in the hands of extremely neurotic persons—and sometimes great countries have been ruled by irrational madmen. There is no evidence that the State Department ever used a psychiatrist to help it in the problems of dealing with such persons as Adolf Hitler or Joseph Stalin. Yet some of your professional colleagues have told me that Hitler was certainly paranoid and Stalin was to some degree pathological in his distrust of the outside world.

It is not enough for Federal agencies to gather "personality folders" on present-day leaders of foreign countries, or future leaders. I do not doubt that there are thick files on Mr. Khrushchev and on those who may succeed him some day, just as the Kremlin has thick dossiers on U.S. officialdom—present and future.

The American need, as I see it, is to bring psychiatric judgment into the mainstream of evaluation and policymaking now.

The U.S. Government uses giant computers for 24-hour-a-day, split-second North American air and sea defense. But with all due respect to the electronic "brains," the fact is that there are vast untapped resources of the human brain which are needed round-the-clock, too.

Avoiding World War III is very much of a health problem; it is a psychiatric, psychological, social, anthropologic, economic, military problem.

It is a problem which commands the mobilization of every conceivable skill in human relations.

There are "psychological gaps" in our time. This includes the gap between what we know and what we practice; between what we know we should know but don't know and what we are in the process of learning.

It is your task to help close these gaps.

Federal obligations for total research for social sciences

[Thousands of dollars]

Departments	Fiscal years		
	1961	1962	1963
Total, all departments	44,405	64,675	95,210
Agriculture	18,767	20,092	21,892
Commerce	2,437	2,834	3,811
Defense	215	263	342
Health, Education, and Welfare	14,721	20,016	27,624
Interior	1,559	2,038	2,260
Labor	1,659	3,313	6,237
State	190	7,246	19,955
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	40	120	120
Civil Aeronautics Board	70	68	108
Federal Aviation Agency	85	120	60
Federal Trade Commission	152	144	274
Housing and Home Finance Agency		375	1,350
Library of Congress	25	70	80
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	523	1,000	2,000
National Science Foundation	2,773	5,902	7,214
Small Business Administration	304	304	639
Smithsonian Institution	413	395	637
Office of Emergency Planning	472	375	607

Source: Federal Funds for Science, No. XI.

Federal obligations for total research for psychology

[Thousands of dollars]

Departments	Fiscal years		
	1961	1962	1963
Total, all agencies	50,655	64,058	83,869
Department of Commerce	117	120	119
Department of Defense	17,177	18,441	20,400
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	26,910	33,594	44,631
Civil Service Commission	165	171	185
Federal Aviation Agency	274	364	394
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	1,000	5,000	10,000
National Science Foundation	3,319	4,417	6,214
Veterans' Administration	1,693	1,951	1,926

Source: Federal Funds for Science, No. XI.

COMMON SITUS PICKETING: THE NEED FOR ONE LABOR LAW IN AMERICA, NOT TWO

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr.

HUMPHREY], the assistant majority leader, and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

This bill, the so-called common situs picketing legislation, would, if enacted, reverse the Supreme Court's decision in the *Denver Building and Construction Trades Council* case (341 U.S. 675). For over a decade, this decision has adversely affected thousands of building and construction trades workers throughout America and has resulted regrettably in two labor policies in this country: One which applies in an industrial plant, and another which applies on a jobsite.

A Republican President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, first recommended that legislation be enacted along the precise lines we have offered today. That was in 1954. He, and members of his administration acting on his behalf, repeated that recommendation on numerous subsequent occasions.

A Democratic President, John F. Kennedy, as a Senator in 1959, coauthored with me, and some others in both parties, S. 2643 which sought to overcome the Denver decision.

I mentioned that, as a result of the Denver decision, we have two labor policies in America. The employees of a factory can engage in peaceful picketing in a labor dispute. That is their right under the law. Construction workers, on the other hand, are inequitably restricted in this basic freedom because of a technicality in the law which did not take into account the special facts of the building and construction industry.

In the construction industry, instead of one employer with different departments for different kinds of work, there are numerous contractors on the jobsite doing different kinds of work. Yet, under the Denver decision, if the Electricians Union pickets a jobsite because of a dispute with the electrical contractor and the bricklayers, carpenters, and other trades do not cross the picket line, it is held that the Electricians Union is guilty of causing a secondary boycott in violation of section 8(b)(4)(A) of the Taft-Hartley Act because the pickets are said to be inducing the bricklayers and other trades to strike with the object of compelling the prime contractor who employs them to stop doing business with the electrical contractor. Yet it is legal for the electricians union representing electrician employees in a factory to picket the factory site even though the production and shipping room employees and employees represented by other unions in the factory refuse to cross the picket line. This is simply and patently unfair. Change in this decade-old injustice is long overdue.

I agree with the late, distinguished Senator Robert Taft who held that the secondary boycott should be outlawed when it injures the business of a third person who is wholly unconcerned in the disagreement between an employer and his employees. The difficulty, however, is that this principle cannot reasonably be applied to employers in the construction industry. On a jobsite these employers are either engaged as joint venturers or in the relationship of contractors and subcontractors in the work at that site. Thus, within the economic facts of this industry, these employers are neither "third persons" nor "wholly unconcerned" in a lawful labor dispute relating to higher wages, shorter hours, or better conditions of employment, or other lawful objectives by the employees at such site. The realities of the relationships which exist at a jobsite simply refute any valid claim that any of these employers are neutral to any dispute which might occur on that site.

On January 11, 1954, President Eisenhower in a message to Congress recognized this fact when he stated that:

> The prohibitions in the act against secondary boycotts are designed to protect innocent third parties from being injured in labor disputes that are not their concern. The true secondary boycott is indefensible and must not be permitted. The act must not, however, prohibit legitimate concerted activities against other than innocent parties. I recommend that the act be clarified by making it explicit that concerted action against * * * an employer on a construction project who, together with other employers, is engaged in work on the site of the project, will not be treated as a secondary boycott.

This bill we now introduce is thus exactly the Eisenhower recommendation.

This recommendation of a Republican President has had not only the endorsement of the executive council of the AFL–CIO on behalf of the combined labor movement, of the various building and construction trades unions, but also of many building and construction contractors as well. In 1960, officials of the Mason Contractors Association of America, representing 2,000 affiliated mason contractors; the National Electrical Contractors Association, representing more than 15,000 small electrical contracting concerns; and the Painting & Decorating Contractors of America as well as other individual contractors indicated their support for this corrective legislation to the House Committee on Education and Labor which favorably reported this legislation.

I think it is also important to note that in April 1949, when the National Labor Relations Board first rendered its administrative decision in the Denver Building and Construction Trades Council Case, the Taft-Hartley Act had been in effect for only 20 months. The NLRB had no previous experience with the building and construction industry because it had not taken jurisdiction of this industry during the years 1935 to 1947 when the Wagner Act was in effect.

In 1959, when Congress, by the Landrum-Griffin Act, added sections 8(e) and 8(f) to the National Labor Relations Act, it recognized that the typical building and construction job or project is an integrated economic enterprise even though numerous different employers may be engaged in the performance of such work.

Mr. President, this inequality must be corrected. I do hope that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare can at an early date hold a hearing to consider this measure and that the Administration will favorably urge such action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill just introduced may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1437) to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended to add the following proviso at the end thereof: *"Provided further,* That nothing contained in clause (B) of this paragraph (4) shall be construed to make unlawful, where not otherwise unlawful, any strike or refusal to perform services at the site of the construction, alteration, painting, or repair of a building, structure, or other work and directed at any of several employers who are in the construction industry and are jointly engaged as joint venturers or in the relationship of contractors and subcontractors in such construction, alteration, painting, or repair at such site, and there is a labor dispute, not unlawful under this Act or in violation of an existing collective bargaining contract, relating to the wages, hours, or other working conditions of employees employed at such site by any of such employers, provided that in the case of any such site which is located at any military facility or installation of the Army, Navy, or Air Force, or which is located at a facility or installation of any other department or agency of the Government if a major purpose of such facility or installation is, or will be, the development, production, testing, firing, or launching of munitions, weapons, missiles, or space vehicles, prior written notice of intent to strike or to refuse to perform services of not less than ten days shall be given by the labor organization involved to the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, to any State or territorial agency established to mediate and conciliate disputes within the State or territory where such site is located, to the several employers who are jointly engaged at such site, to the Army, Navy, or Air Force or other department or agency of the Government concerned with the particular facility or installation, and to any national or international labor organization of which the labor organization involved is an affiliate. The notice requirements of the preceding proviso are in addition to, and not in lieu of the notice requirements prescribed by section 8(d) of the Act."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to my able friend.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy and proud to be associated with the dis-

tinguished senior Senator from California in the introduction of this proposed legislation. As I recall, the same legislation was once introduced by the then Senator from Massachusetts, now the President of the United States, President Kennedy, along with the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is a rare privilege for me now to be a cosponsor with the Senator from California of remedial legislation. It is remedial because, as labor-management relations have developed in this country, it has been found that there were certain weaknesses in the Labor-Management Act. One of them is in respect to what we call situs picketing.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The proposed legislation we have introduced would correct that weakness, which I think is an inequity in the law. It is a proposal which has brought support by responsible officials of Government and responsible representatives in labor and in management.

I commend the Senator for his initiative in this matter. He and I have talked about it a number of times. We have consulted with labor lawyers as well as with members of the construction industry. I believe if we can get action on this proposed legislation it will do much to relieve certain tensions in the labor-management field.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend from Minnesota. I am glad to join him in sponsoring this proposed legislation.

Basically, the bill would cure, as the Senator has suggested, an inequity in the law. We should have in this Nation one labor policy applying to men and women who toil for a living in this country. We have, regrettably, two labor policies with respect to the area covered by our proposed legislation.

I very much hope that we may look forward to early hearings on this proposed legislation, because it is in the interest of the people.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not believe there is need for further comment. The Senator's statement on the introduction of the bill is one in which I join. I know the Senator will permit me to do so. There is no need for burdening the RECORD with additional, explanatory information or material about our bill. It is a good bill.

I join with the Senator in urging upon the appropriate committee, the committee chairman, and subcommittee chairman to hold prompt hearings.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CANCER

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in the Congress and throughout the land, much time and energy is devoted to discussing and planning the national defense. This is as it should be, for America must be strong and well-fortified against any possible foreign aggression.

But, the Nation must also be alerted to an internal threat more deadly than an H-bomb and more sinister than a network of spies. This enemy kills more Americans every year than the number of our servicemen who were killed during World War II. The menace is not 90 miles from our shores, but in our very midst, actively at work to destroy our people. This enemy's name is not Castro—but cancer.

While it is more dramatic to speak of the great danger which threatens America in a superbomb which can annihilate hundreds of thousands of people at a time, we cannot turn our backs on the millions of Americans who, if present trends continue, are foredoomed to die of cancer. This is not a problem for which there is allocated $50 billion a year as for national defense, but one on which the Federal Government spends less than $1 per American or $150 million annually.

No matter how strongly we feel about the threat of communism to our way of life, not all of us can take up arms and enter the fray. Similarly, few of us have been blessed with the ability to be in the vanguard of research scientists and medical men who meet this enemy daily and strive to conquer it. But each of us is charged with the obligation of supplying the money, material, and moral support needed, both for an adequate defense of our Nation, and for an all-out war on cancer.

America is justly proud of the fine doctors and research scientists who are our strongest defense against the enemy. We all know that one day complete victory will be achieved and we are pleased and hopeful each time a battle is won.

We have made progress and the future is promising. Twenty years ago, only one out of every seven cancer victims was cured. Today, the figure is one out of every three. But it could be better—it must be better. The facile approach to the problem would be simply to say "Give more money to the National Institutes of Health." But, we have been doing that and still we are told that the cure for cancer is decades away.

Each year, for example, the President asks the Congress for certain appropriations to operate the National Cancer Institute, and to make possible the awarding of a number of research grants. Almost every year, the Congress oversubscribes the President's request. We are willing to spend any amount to cure cancer, but we need the guidance of experts to tell us where the money can do the most good. We also need to alert the public to the fact that this is truly a national emergency which, if present trends continue, will eventually strike one out of every four persons in the United States.

Perhaps we need a shift in emphasis and a new approach. Without doubt, in the words of Dr. Sidney Farber of the Harvard Medical School, "we need to make a master blueprint of our resources in manpower, building, equipment, and private financial support of research, to give us a clear picture of the deficiencies which must be met."

With this objective in mind, I will tomorrow introduce a resolution calling upon the President to convene a White House Conference on Cancer, patterned after previous White House Conferences such as those on children and youth and on narcotics addiction.

Years ago, I was among those who called for the convening of a White House Conference on Narcotics Addiction. This meeting, which was finally called last October brought together hundreds of experts in this field and made possible an unprecedented exchange of ideas and information about this health and social problem. One of my own bills (S. 863) was, in fact, a direct result of my having attended the Conference and acted upon a suggestion presented there. I believe the same results can be achieved at a cancer conference.

More specifically, I expect that such a conference would be attended by American medical men and scientists, representatives of the Congress, Government agencies, universities and private foundations, an appropriate number of recent recipients of Federal grants for cancer research, officials of the World Health Organization and cancer experts from foreign nations.

Their recommendations should cover the following points:

First. A plan to outline how Federal, State and private financial resources can best be spent to insure cooperative efforts and maximum use of available facilities;

Second. Means of encouraging sufficient technicians, scientists and medical personnel to enter the field;

Third. Machinery for a continuing consultation between scientists in the United States and other nations, in order to obtain the maximum international cooperation, working through existing United Nations facilities as well as engaging in unilateral contact and consultation when the facts or situation so require.

Mr. President, in the name of 40 million Americans whose lives will be devastated by this disease, I urge prompt passage of this resolution and speedy mobilization of all our resources in this effort.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Thursday, May 2, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 1, 1963:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Adm. Jerauld Wright, U.S. Navy, retired, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to China.

Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India.

E. Allan Lightner, Jr., of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Kingdom of Libya.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 1 to the class indicated:

To be career ministers

Aaron S. Brown, of New Hampshire.
Henry A. Byroade, of Indiana.
Fulton Freeman, of California.
Graham A. Martin, of Florida.

The nominations beginning Bryan R. Frisbie, of California, for reappointment in the Foreign Service as a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, and ending Raymond Villemarette, of Louisiana, to be a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 4, 1963.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Tribute to a Dedicated Educator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in the span of a few recent years, Richmond Heights in the 22d Congressional District of Ohio has become one of the most rapidly developing suburbs in the State, and with a population increase exceeding 500 percent it has grown from a village to city status.

To provide adequate educational facilities for the influx of children, the village school had to be enlarged quickly to the proportions necessary to meet the needs of a city. It was a tremendous challenge and one man, Russell R. Fair, in a great measure is responsible for the successful transition.

Thirty-five years ago Mr. Fair was one of the 2 teachers in the Richmond Heights Village School of 3 rooms and 50 pupils in grades 1 through 8. He has served the cause of education continuously and will retire after the current school year. Through progressive study and professional associations Mr. Fair augmented his knowledge and skills in the matters pertaining to public instruction and administration. In the Richmond Heights local school district he advanced from teacher to principal and in 1958 was elevated to the high office of superintendent.

Implemented by his knowledgeable leadership the school system will soon be complete. It now has 40 rooms, well-equipped chemistry and physics laboratories, 44 teachers, 16 clerical and service personnel, a guidance counselor, an excellent library, a librarian, a large cafeteria and student enrollment of 678 in kindergarten through eighth grade and 249 in high school. The value of the physical assets exceeds $1,600,000 and the school is operating on a budget of $529,000.

As an educator, Superintendent Fair was dedicated to the educational welfare of the students, their needs were his primary interest and concern. As an administrator he exercised vision and intelligent application of sound moral principles. He wisely evaluated the qualifications of each new staff member. As a financier he objectively analyzed the criteria involved in the various expansions of the school before submitting a recommendation for a levy or bond issue. He consistently maintained that the taxpayer be given the maximum value obtainable for each tax dollar expended. As a public servant he was always acutely conscious of his obligation to the community, the school, and its program.

Superintendent Fair served with integrity and efficiency in all areas of his many responsibilities. Public service rendered on such a lofty plane of proper motivation and conduct deserves high recognition and deep, humble gratitude. Thank you, Mr. Fair, for an exacting task well done. Best wishes for good health and happiness in your retirement.

Marine Corps Weekly Friday Evening Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today received by mail an invitation from the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and I have been informed that all Members of Congress have or will shortly receive similar invitations. It is concerning this matter that I desire to make a few remarks.

In the 188 years since the dedicated and freedom-loving farmers of Lexington and Concord startled the world with their strong defense of the ideals of an independent Nation, there have been many demonstrations of the patriotic ardor which was so important to the establishment of this country. It is perhaps unfortunate that all of us cannot daily demonstrate to our neighbors that we are individually possessed of those beliefs which have contributed so significantly to the moral and physical strength which has always characterized this Nation and its citizens. With the expansion of our interests on the international scene, there has been a tendency to concentrate our thoughts on domestic economy and international diplomacy. As a result, I think we often overlook the basic yet profound principles which transformed our land from one which was suppressed and exploited into one which is dynamic and ever devoted to the liberty of its citizens.

To remind us of our heritage and instill in our children the basic values of the American way of life we have erected many memorials to our great leaders and patriots. Though inspiration can be found in these monuments, it is perhaps more meaningful to discover a living link with the spirit of 1775. Within a few short blocks of this Capitol there is an event each Friday which dramatically displays the qualities which inspired the minutemen and have continued to be the fundamental force behind each succeeding generation of Americans.

In dress uniform adorned with colorful medals which they are honored to wear for distinguished service to their country, the marines of the Marine barracks, Eighth and I Streets SE., conduct an evening parade each Friday from mid-May until late September. This hour-long ceremony is held on the parade ground surrounded by buildings and traditions which began over 160 years ago. On a quiet June afternoon in 1801, President Thomas Jefferson rode on horseback from the Executive Mansion into Southeast Washington and directed that a marine barracks be established in the exact area where it stands today. In this weekly review our marines are able to demonstrate the virtues of loyalty, soldierly bearing, and sincere devotion to the ideals of America which we hold in such high esteem.

Upon entering the barracks one is transported instantly from the bustling city to a quiet tree-lined area surrounded by reminders of an earlier era. At the north end of the parade ground is the Commandant's house currently occupied by Gen. David M. Shoup. This remarkable residence, built in 1801, is considered to be the oldest continually occupied Federal structure in the Capital City. To the east and south stands the barracks itself with its three ramparts looking much like a small walled city. From 9 p.m. when the brilliantly shined brass ship's bell is sounded sharply, the parade is performed with great skill and precision.

The drama which exists throughout this famous ceremony is very evident as the celebrated drum and bugle corps plays a slow march and moves across the length of the parade field, returns to its original position, and sounds "Retreat." At this point, everyone stands, raises his eyes to the floodlit sky, and watches the American flag slowly lowered as the national anthem is played. Perhaps no-

where else in America is our national color lowered at the end of the day with such dignity, respect, and meaning.

The evening concludes when the combined elements of the Marine Band and Drum and Bugle Corps play an orchestration of taps under dimmed floodlights. The whole barracks area then becomes completely dark and a taps echo is sounded by a lone bugler who is out of sight but whose music reaches the very depths of every individual who hears it.

In all respects, this weekly Friday evening parade commands admiration for its color and precision but it is its unusual quality of regenerating a sense of pride in and love for America which set it apart from other reminders of a citizens responsibility to his nation. I commend this masterful presentation to the attention of all Members of this distinguished legislative body and urge each of you and your visitors to accept this invitation to spend a truly rewarding evening at the Marine barracks. The event passes all too soon but its impact will certainly remain with you always.

The 75th Anniversary of the Chartering of Temple University, Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, in 1861, the year which ushered in one of the mightiest upheavals in American history, a young sophomore at Yale answered the call of his country and joined "Lincoln's Army." From 1862 to 1864 this brilliant youth of stable New England ancestry marched with the boys in blue. Graphic stories from the pen of Russell Conwell, vividly depicting the horrors of the war, earned for him a position as cub reporter and ultimately an around the world trip as foreign correspondent for the New York Tribune and the Boston Traveler.

Enroute from Baghdad to Ninevah, on the banks of the Tigris River a Turkish guide, emulating the timeworn customs of his progenitors, wove endless tales for the entertainment of his American tourists. Ever alert, young Conwell was deeply impressed by a legend about a wealthy Persian farmer, one Ali Hafed, who, lured by the stories of a Buddhist priest, deserted his fruitful lands to wander in search of fabulous wealth in mythical diamond fields. Far and wide he roamed, footsore and weary. Youth and wealth dwindled into nothingness and Ali Hafed, aged and discouraged, died an unhappy pauper.

"And so," said the guide, "after searching far and wide, for many years, Ali Hafed, reduced to poverty, disappointed and disillusioned, died, far from home. Not long after, the fabulous diamonds, acres of them, in the search for which Ali Hafed had devoted his life, were found on his own land." Having finished his story, the Turkish guide chattered on in an effort to amuse his American patrons. But the seeds of a great truth had been sown in a strong mind.

To the guide and other tourists this was just another story, but to the young correspondent it was a lesson in life. To him it said, "Your diamonds are not in far distant mountains or in yonder seas; they are in your own backyard, if you but dig for them." Russell Conwell returned to America.

During the ensuing years Conwell sowed the seeds of service which reaped for him his harvest of opportunities. As a lawyer in Boston, at the age of 36, he was consulted for advice concerning the disposal of a bankrupt church in Lexington. With ready sympathy he determined that the church should not be sold, but rebuilt. How he was ordained and accepted his first charge in that church; how a certain deacon who came to hear him invited him to a struggling Philadelphia pastorate at the salary of $800 a year; how, with 57 cents, he opened the building fund for the Baptist Temple; all these and many more were episodes illustrative of a great spirit and a remarkable vision.

One evening after the Baptist Temple had become a reality, a young man went to Dr. Conwell in his study, expressed a desire to prepare for the ministry, and asked for advice. Always welcoming the opportunity to help someone, Dr. Conwell offered to teach him 1 night a week. Could he bring some friends? As many as he wished. On the appointed evening, seven earnest young men appeared. Here were Conwell's diamonds, here at his home, in his own community, in Philadelphia.

That was in 1884. Within a short time the services of other teachers were enlisted and it was necessary to rent a room, then a building, then two. Within 4 years the group had grown from 7 to 590 students, a college charter was secured and Dr. Conwell took office as the first president.

Meanwhile Dr. Conwell had utilized the old fable to help his enterprise. His famous lecture, "Acres of Diamonds," was first given at a reunion of some of his old Civil War comrades, as he himself described it, "a mere accidental address." But it was called for again and again. It encouraged everyone to "do what you can with what you have where you are today." After each lecture, some worthy student received a check to help him continue his education.

It was 75 years ago, on May 12, 1888, that Dr. Conwell secured the charter of Temple College. This was the beginning of a university which today has an enrollment of almost 31,000.

No one can now say with certainty that Dr. Conwell envisioned a university in his attempt to help one young man, though it is known that he had long pondered the problem of those denied an education in the usual way.

It is certain, however, that the young men and young women who attended those early classes soon became Dr. Conwell's "Diamonds," just as the educational facilities he offered them became their Acres of Diamonds.

In 1891, the College of Liberal Arts established a day department and obtained the power to confer degrees.

By now, the increasing popularity of Dr. Conwell's doctrine of "education for all" brought such a large student body that it became necessary to build Temple College Building and acquire several halls and dwellings adjacent to it.

The growth of the university proceeded with the same extraordinary rapidity. Throughout the years, the different units and divisions came into existence as follows: in 1891, the Samaritan Hospital—now the Temple University Hospital; in 1893, the School of Theology; in 1895, the School of Law; in 1901, the School of Medicine and the School of Pharmacy; in 1907, the School of Dentistry—formerly the Philadelphia Dental College, one of the oldest and largest institutions of its kind in the United States—and the Garretson Hospital—Hospital of Oral Surgery and a part of the Philadelphia Dental College; in 1913, the School of Music; in 1915, the School of Chiropody; in 1918, the School of Commerce—now the School of Business and Public Administration; in 1919, the College of Education; in 1921, the Evening Technical Institute, the School of Oral Hygiene, and the Greatheart Hospital—Maternity Department of the Medical School; in 1935, the Stella Elkins Tyler School of Fine Arts; in 1945, the Day Technical Institute; in 1948, the Community College; and in 1950 the School of Medical Technology.

During the administration of the second president, Charles E. Beury, who was appointed in 1925 to succeed the founder, the university continued its advancement in educational improvement and physical expansion. In addition to the divisions which were formed during this period, other notable achievements were the building of a stadium; the rehabilitation of the professional schools; the building of Carnell Hall, a 12-story recitation building; a new and well-equipped medical school housing several important clinics and laboratories; the building of Mitten Hall, a beautifully and handsomely furnished student recreation center; and construction of the Sullivan Memorial Library.

On September 26, 1941, Robert Livingston Johnson was elected as the third president of Temple University.

In 1946, in an attempt to provide for the increasing influx of students, Temple University opened two new undergraduate centers. As a supplement to these centers, Cedarbrook, a freshman unit, was opened in 1947. By the addition of these college centers, hundreds of students, who could not have attended college, were given the opportunity to begin classes.

At the present time, the Cedarbrook Center houses the Community College where terminal courses are offered for students who wish training for specific objectives, but are unable to take 4-year programs.

In 1956, Temple University's building program accelerated. A new hospital building, an 8-story outpatient building, and an ancillary service building were added to the medical school facilities.

During the summer, classes were held for the first time in Curtis Hall, a newly

constructed classroom building. Modern in design and completely air-conditioned, Curtis Hall added 50 classrooms to university facilities.

Also in 1956, construction was completed on Peabody Hall, a new dormitory for women.

Barton Hall, the new science building, was completed in 1960, and Johnson Hall, a new dormitory for men, was opened in 1961. A new chemistry building is virtually complete.

With these projects, Temple University is well advanced in its extensive development program which, eventually, will encompass a 40-acre tract.

Under the leadership of Dr. Millard E. Gladfelter, elected president in 1959, Temple University continues to fulfill a distinct purpose built upon the ideal of Russell H. Conwell, "to make an education possible for all young men and young women who have good minds and the will to work."

A permanent planning committee keeps its fingers on the pulse of the times and continually recommends new offerings as well as changes in curriculums and methods. As it observes its diamond jubilee, Temple University is a growing institution, growing in outlook as well as in size, in usefulness and in the determination to unearth the acres of diamonds yet uncovered.

A Tribute to Cyril and Methodius, on the Occasion of the 1100th Anniversary of the Conversion of the Slavs to Christianity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 1, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a world that is currently engaged in a struggle between the God-fearing decency of democracy and the godless outrage of communism, it is highly rewarding to look back upon Christian history, that we may point up deeds of glory involving those persons dedicated to the will of God. In this way, we are able to trace, in part, the career of Christianity, and to draw from that story the strength inherent therein. This is an old Christian custom, particularly popular with the Slav people of eastern Europe, and one that has served them well over the centuries.

As a people, the Slavs have always sought in this way to emphasize their devotion to the Lord and to Christian teachings, by hailing the names of their great apostles, Cyril and Methodius, whose work in behalf of Christianity, 1,100 years ago, entitles them to sainthood and world recognition.

Cyril and Methodius were brothers, born in Thessalonica in the years 827 and 826, respectively. Although they came from a family long established in politics, and were thereby in a position to serve as senators, both of them rejected political honors in order to enter the church, and thereupon went to live in a monastery. In time Cyril was called upon by the Emperor Michael III to go among the Khazars, a Tartar people theretofore devoted to the pagan religion, and teach Christianity to all who were willing to hear him. This required of Cyril that he learn the language of the Khazars before he even could begin his task. But learn the language he did, and in short time was busily engaged in the process of converting the Khazars to the Christian belief.

Meanwhile, a call was received from the Bulgarians of Thrace and Moesia, and Methodius was sent to minister to their needs. He, too, was highly successful, baptising Bogoris, King of the Bulgarians, and with the blessing of the monarch, evangelizing hundreds and thousands of the Bulgarian people.

At the request of Rastislav, Duke of Moravia, the brothers next entered the Slavic countries within the Moravian domain. German missionaries already had sought to convert the Moravians, without success. It was known, however, that the Germans' inability to speak the Slavonic language was largely responsible for their failure in this regard. On account of their vast lingual abilities, Cyril and Methodius were chosen to try again where the German missionaries had failed. In preparation, they compiled a Slavonic translation of the Scriptures and chief liturgical books, and by their services in the mother tongue were able to win the hearts of the Slav people.

Following their success in Moravia, the brothers were called to Rome to explain their teaching technique to their superiors. Here Cyril died, in the year 869, at the age of 42, thereby depriving the world of one of its great teachers and great linguists. And yet, before passing, he had played so great a part in the lives of the people of eastern Europe that their descendents were never to forget him. Indeed, the Scriptures and the chief liturgical works translated by the brothers into the Slavonic language became the foundation of all Slavonic literature. Moreover, the Cyrilic alphabet, modified out of the Greek by Cyril, superseded the more ancient Slavonic alphabet over a wide area.

At the request of the Moravian princes, Rastislav and Svatopluk, and the Slav Prince Kocel of Pannonia, the Roman Emperor Adrian II formed an archdiocese of Moravia and Pannonia, declared it independent of the German church, and appointed Methodius archbishop.

In the capacity of archbishop, Methodius became a highly controversial figure in consequence of his insistence upon using the Slavonic language in the liturgy. Time and again jealous priests denounced his conduct to the Pope, charging him with unorthodoxy and misinterpretation. And yet, notwithstanding temporary doubts arising from all the accusations, the Pope was obliged to stand behind the work of Methodius, in the knowledge that he was succeeding in spreading the word of the Lord, where no one else, save his departed brother, had managed to succeed in even the slightest degree.

Following many years of strenuous labor in behalf of the Almighty, Methodius passed away on April 6, in the year 885, but not before he was able to recommend a Moravian disciple, Gorazd, as his own successor.

In former times the feasts of Saints Cyril and Methodius were celebrated in Bohemia and Moravia on March 9, but the date was changed by Pius IX to July 5. Leo XIII, by his Encyclical "Grande Munus" of September 30, 1880, extended the feast to the universal church.

To everyone concerned with the worldwide struggle for men's minds, the deeds of Cyril and Methodius have always stood forth as symbols of God-fearing labor and love. Even unto this day, in the regions where Cyril and Methodius lived out their lives, the work of Christ goes on, in the face of great obstacles. Nor will it ever be any different, so long as the Slav people retain their love for the Almighty, which is another way of saying forever.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 2, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who art the center and soul of every sphere, and yet to each trusting heart how near, in Thee we live and move and have our being. Let not any callousness on our part make Thy presence unreal to us. Wherever goodness is, or truth, or beauty, there Thou art.

Make sensitive our spirits, that knowing Thy grace and power, we may be cleansed and strengthened.

With all our imperfections and fallible judgments, grant unto us a compassion for others which understands and pities and forgives.

In their ministry in public affairs, may Thy servants here be so strengthened with might that the tyranny of majorities and the tirades of minorities may be equally impotent to sway them from the right, as Thou dost give them to see the right.

Undergird us all, we pray, wherever we stand in these days of destiny, with the glorious vision of eternal values which have supported men before us who sought ends too great to be reached in their own lifetime.

We ask it, O Father of our spirits, who hath been our dwelling place in all generations, in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord, in whom Thou hast freely given us all things. Amen.